

Collection Of Articles (Refuting Shia)

May Allah (swt) Destroy Them



The religion of the Shiah was founded by a Jew from Yemen called Abdullah bin Saba'. This religion has started with the assassination of the rightly guided Khalifa Uthman and branched into many sections.

**Edited & Designed By
TheVista**

Sunnis Vs. Shiites

Introduction

Attributing kufr to a person, shouting, and blustering are the weapon of the weak. This page is not dedicated to the weaks but for facts and evidences that deserve a pause from you to contemplate through the page and know its goals. We have facts that may be published for the first time, and we have pictures, documents, audios and videos that prove our point. This page is for Sunnis who want to learn about Shi'ism and for those intelligent, open-minded Shia who are seeking the truth away from prejudice.

We are asking Muslims to unite and we are seeking unity. But unity should be based on the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His messenger, NOT at the expense of Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His messenger. Therefore, we adopted this Dialogue as a method to solve the discord and a course to elucidate the truth.

Bookmark this page: <http://shia.islamicweb.com>

Articles About Shi'ism

Additional references are available in [Arabic](#)

Iran -- The anti-Islamic Regime

- | [The Dismal Reality of Ahl-Sunnah in Iran](#): When will Iran stop killing Sunnis?
- | [The Iranian Revolution](#): An exposure of the American Plans.
- | [Dialogue between a Muslim Scholar and Some Shia students](#)

For Sunnis:

- | [A Dialogue with those who Disagree with this Site](#) **NEW**
- | [Are we allowed to ignore our differences?](#) The Story of Abu Baker & Zakat-Evaders
- | [A Poignant Message to the Muslim Ummah](#): The historic Khutbah of Shaykh Hudhaifee (Imaam of Masjid Nabawi). MUST READ
- | [The Creed of Shi'a](#): from their own sources.
- | [What do the Shi'ites say about Sunni Muslims?](#)
- | [What Shi'ites say about their 12 Imams](#): Are Imams better than prophets?
- | [The practice of lying \(Taqiyyah\) in the Shi'ite faith](#): Their scholars command them to lie!

- | [Shi'ite insults against the wives of the Prophet ﷺ](#)
- | [How many Shia are there?](#)
- | [The Islamic Ruling on Shi'ites](#): Quotes from the Prophet, members of his household, and major Sunni scholars.
- | [The History of the Shia](#): with explanations of thier major sects.
- | [Sunnis vs. Shi'ites](#): An Outline Of The Differences Between The Sunnis and The Shi'ite in Matters of Faith And Doctrine.
- | [Al-Khutut Al-Aridah](#): A Refutation And Exposition of The Sources of Shi'ism. All with references.
- | [The Shi'ites as mentioned in the Holy Quran](#): Quotes with comments.
- | [The Views of Ahl Sunnah towards the Sahaabah](#) By Isa Al-Bosnee. **NEW**


A Quiet Dialogue with Shia:

- | [Can you, Shia, answer these questions?](#) A challenge to every Shia **NEW**
- | [The Marriage of Umm Kulthoom, daughter of Ali, to Umar](#) Defending Umar (RA) against Shia's accusations **NEW**
- | [Who Killed Al-Hussain?](#) Unmasking the other villains of Karbala
- | [Who are Ahlul-Bait?](#)
- | [The Story of Fadak](#) The Fadak Area Between Abu Bakr & Fatimah
- | [The purification verse and Hadith Al-Kisaa'](#)
- | [The Integrity of the Prophet's Companions](#)
- | [Answering Shi'ism](#): by Qur'an and logic.
- | [In Defense of Abu Hurayrah](#): A Reply to some erroneous claims.
- | [Replying against Shia from the Shia's most authentic book, Nahjul Balagha!:](#) By Imam Ali Bin Abi Talib (may Allah be pleased with him) **NEW**
- | [The Myth of the Shia Mahdi](#) What's the story behind this lie? **NEW**

Temporary Marrige:

- | [The Shia practice of the forbidden temporary marriage](#)
- | [Temporary Marriage \(Mut'a\): A Plea from A Muslim Sister.](#)
- | [Temporary Marriage \(Mut'a\) & Its Illegitimacy in Islam:](#) From Nida'ul Islam magazine.

Recommended Books

- | [Exposing Al-Tijani's Lies in His Book: "Then I was Guided"](#) **NEW**: The book called "Then I was Guided" was written by Shia's scholar (Al-Tijani) as a way to convert Muslims into Shi'ism. Since it does gather all of the Shi'a's claims, by replying to that book, we have indeed replied to all of Shia's claims against Islam.
This book is highly recommended!
- | [The Muslim Scholars, "Fatwa" Concerning Khomani](#) **NEW**: No one has ever hurt Islam during this century more than this Shaytan.
- | **A Response to "Peshawar Nights"**. [Introduction](#) [Chapter One](#)
- | [Shi'ah Concept of Temporary Marriage \(Mut'ah\)](#) by Dr. Ahmad 'Abdullah Salamah.
- | [Extremist Shiites : The Ghulat Sects](#) 

Recommended Web Sites

- | [Ansar Al-Husain](#) : Highly recommended
- | [An Exposition of the Fallacy of Shi'ite Beliefs from Their Own Sources](#) 
- | [Iranian Sunni League web site](#) 

[This article was published in the 24th issue of [Nida'ul Islam](http://islam.com.au) magazine (<http://islam.com.au>), July - August 1998]

**Chairman of the Ahlus Sunnah Association in Iran,
Dr. Abdul Rahman Albaloushy Uncovers**

The Dismal Reality of Ahlus Sunnah in Iran

Brief introduction of the Sheikh

Sheikh Abdul Rahman al-Baluchy completed his secondary education in Iran, after which he was admitted to the Islamic University of al-Madinah al-Munawarah in 1979 where he studied Arabic before joining the Usuluddin (Principles of Faith) and Da'wah college. He reached his second year of studies before the policy to expel Iranian students was implemented. He went to Syria to complete his Shari'ah studies at Damascus universi, where he graduated in 1984. He also studied under the scholars of Damascus, such as Sheikh Abdul Qadir al-Arna`out and others. Upon graduation, he enrolled for his Masters degree at al-Awza'y college in Beirut where he graduated in 1989. His thesis was on the Baluchi people and Baluchistan. He enrolled for his Ph.D. at the same college and graduated in 1995. His Ph.D. thesis was on "The Transformation of Islamic Thought in Iran from Sunni to Shi'ah during the Safawi Rule". This same topic was not accepted for his Masters Degree owing to certain political reasons. He currently directs the Ahlus Sunnah Association in Iran, London Office.

Is there a single capital city in the world without a Sunni mosque, with the exception to Tehran -the capital of the Shi'ah-, which has forty Christian churches and a cemetery for the Baha'is

There is no Sunni director in any of the government authorities, ministries, embassies, or local and provincial governments, hospitals or principalities; not even in the lowest government posts anywhere in Iran.

Whilst we are living in the twentieth century, we find a third of the population of a nation deprived of their most basic rights. Is there any other country on the face of the earth which prevents its people from choosing names like Umar, A'ishah, Hafsa, Abu Bakr, Zubair...

The double-faced regime was able, through raising the banner of Islamic unity, to fool many Muslims outside Iran as they ask them to attend their conferences, and transform their way of thinking within a short period of time.

Would you kindly give us a glimpse of the history of Ahlus Sunnah in Iran, the main areas where they are concentrated and their numbers?

It is an established fact that Iran was a Sunni nation until the Tenth Century of the Hijri calendar. During this period, Iran produced thousands of scholars in every discipline; the most salient of these facts is that the six most authentic Hadith books (ie. Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawood, etc.) were written by scholars from Iran, or scholars who received their education in Iran. However, when the Safawid Shi'ites took control, they established their government on the skulls of the Sunni scholars and jurists. This was one of the reasons for the evacuation of the largest cities that were at the foremost centers of religious sciences, such as Tibriz, Isfahan, Ray, and Tus. There were many Sunni Muslims who were killed, forced into Shi'ism, or compelled to flee to the mountains, leaving Iran as a center for conspiracies against Islam and the Muslims. Fredinand, the ambassador to the Austrian King, remarked: "Had it not been for the Safawids in Iran, we would have been reading the Qur'an this day like the Algerians," meaning that his nation would have been conquered by the Ottoman Muslims. However, the Safawids conspired with the crusaders and the imperialists to halt the Islamic expansion into France and Vienna.

The Sunni Muslims in Iran number about 15 to 20 million, living mainly in the mountainous and border regions. They are mainly Kurds, Turks, Baluchis, and Arabs. There is also a good number living in the cities.

How was the condition of Ahlus Sunnah before the revolution, did they participate in it, and how and what was their reward from this participation?

Ahlu Sunnah hail from non-Persian people. They were regarded as second class citizens under the Shah regime, since they mostly resided in rural areas, as well as the fact that their creed differed from that of the Shi'ah. As the Arabs, Kurds, Baluchis and others of Ahlu Sunnah did not have any role in the idolatrous Persian nationalism, they did not have equal rights socially nor economically with Persians, "The Chosen People"! The Shah regime was secular, non-religious, so it dealt with religions and sects in a similar way. Some of the Ahlu Sunnah scholars have opposed the Shah and his secular regime, and some of these scholars initially sympathised with the Khomeini revolution such as Sheikh Ahmad Mufti Zadah as well as a few others, may Allah forgive them. Sheikh Ahmad Mufti Zadah opposed Khomeini shortly after the revolution. He was arrested and imprisoned for 10 years, even though his sentence was only for five years. He was only released when the authorities felt that he was on the brink of death. I was a witness to the words of Ahmad Mufti Zadah to Khomeini in the latter's house where he said: "Khomeini, you promised me an Islamic republic, however you established a Safawi-Shi'ite republic. Although I believe that I am not permitted to raise arms against you [such was his belief, unfortunately], however, I will fight you politically."

This occurred during the same meeting where my brother Mawlawi Abdul Aziz, may Allah have mercy on him, the representative for Baluchistan in the Authoritative Council, opposed clause 13 of the Iranian constitution, and then resigned from the Council. He later formed, along with Sheikh Zadah, the centralised Consultative Council of Ahlu Sunnah, and held two annual meetings, one in Tehran and one in Baluchistan. Mawlawi Abdul Aziz was also able to obtain a promised allocation of 10,000 square meters of land in Tehran to build a mosque and a centre for Ahlu Sunnah. This promise was given due to internal and external pressures, when the regime was still weak and developing.

This promise, however, was blatantly dishonoured as soon as the regime became stronger. The land allocated for constructing the mosque was confiscated, as well as the

offices and bank accounts of the Consultative Council, whose scholars, members and supporters -both men and women- were detained.

The regime continued in its efforts to destroy the infrastructure of Ahlus Sunnah, spreading between their ranks deviations, innovations and acts of Shirk. They unashamedly told the imprisoned students of Sheikh Zadah: "We hoped that you would have taken up arms against us, so we could have had an excuse to uproot you, as we did with the other parties."

The regime then persecuted any person who dared to call for their rights, and punished them with imprisonment or execut, or degrading their character, as was the case with the martyr Bahman Shakoury. Many Sheikhs were imprisoned, exiled, tortured and humiliated, such as the Baluchistan parliamentarian member Mawlawi Nathar Mohammad who was subjected to sever torture and made false confessions under duress, until he escaped and was able to flee to Pakistan. He was not able to get a visa to enter any of the Gulf countries, not even as a labourer. Sheikh Mawlawi Muhyiddin and Sheikh Dost Mohammed Sirawani were also imprisoned, then exiled to the city of Najaf Abad, as well as many other Sheikhs. There is also Sheikh Ibrahim Dammini who continues to be imprisoned and put to torture for more than five years.

Ahlus Sunnah were rewarded under the current sectarian government with a life of dishonor and subjugation, and their situation is far worse -as I have experienced myself- than that of the Muslims in occupied Palestine. Is there a single capital city in the world without a Sunni mosque, with the exception to Tehran -the capital of the Shi'ah-, which has forty Christian churches and a cemetery for the Baha'is. In all, even the infidel minorities have their temples and places of worship and their freedom of worship, yet Ahlus Sunnah are not allowed to build any mosque or cemetery. Khameni stated after the revolution: "all the Persians in the world can look at Iran as their nation", they are, therefore, first class citizens of Iran, even if they were Magians from India. As for us, we must be exiled from our land because neither us nor our parents accepted Shi'ism or Magianism!

The regime planted the seeds of conflict amongst the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah, and strove to deride the character of the notable scholars, replacing them with government servants.

It then instigated internal conflicts between the scholars, the leaders of the community, and the intellectuals to create an environment filled with distrust and insecurity. They also used some of the ignorant people who adhere to supposedly Sunni Tariqats (orders), to attack the scholars of Ahlus Sunnah, especially Sheikh Ahmad Mufti Zadah, labeling him as a Wahhabi, although the Sheikh did not adhere to the Salafi creed.

The regime then aimed at Ahlus Sunnah schools, and tried to influence their curriculums to incorporate Shi'ateachings, labeling anyone who refuses to do so as a Wahhabi, a "crime" punishable by death in Iran! Add to this that many school principles were initially anti-Salafi, which resulted with many pupils being suspended, expelled, and beaten for merely raising their hands in their prayer, or for defending Sheikhul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, or Abul 'Ala al-Maududi.

However, the double-faced regime was able, through raising the banner of Islamic unity, to fool many Muslims outside Iran as they ask them to attend their conferences, and transform their way of thinking within a short period of time. They became false witnesses within their own people, beguiling them with what they have been taught about the greatness of Islamic unity, without knowing anything about the plight of Ahlus Sunnah inside Iran. They repeat in all simplicity: "we are brothers, there is no difference between us." Despite the imprisonment of the scholars and the demolished Islamic schools, they go to the grave of Khomeini, which has become a worshipped idol, offering their worship, and placing flowers at this grave. Their stance has misled many young minds and opened the way for them to accept or tolerate Shi'ism. A person is further baffled when he realises the

superficiality of these people, their oblivion to the reality and their inability to comprehend the situation. They keep on defending the Rawafidh Shi'ah who are weaving conspiracy after conspiracy against Ahlus Sunnah.

Can you elaborate on the current condition of Ahlus Sunnah in Iran?

Currently, after two decades of the Shiite revolution and the fortification of their rule, they have not secured the rights of the Sunni minority, nor their covenants with them. They began by imprisoning the scholars and the Muslim activists, exiling some, and executing others. They also started to expel Sunni Muslims from government, commerce, and manufacturing posts, and to destroy their infrastructure. I still recall what the Iranian secret service said vengefully to some of the imprisoned Muslim activists: "You are like the large room with large spotlights (the more eminent scholars) and smaller lights (the general scholars), and candles (the general activists); we will first extinguish the large spotlights." This stage has been accomplished as they have killed most of the prominent scholars. "Then we will extinguish the smaller lights"; in this respect many activists have been killed and many others exiled. "Then we will turn the fan to put out the candles." This is an indication of the final stage of forcing people into Shi'ism against their will.

As you can see, the tragedy of Ahlus Sunnah in Iran is unlike any tragedy in the world, considering the nature of the race problem, the falsification of news by the Iranian official press, Government cronies, and the positions of many Muslim movements and activists on the outside who are siding with Iran. Although Muslim minorities everywhere are facing calamities and catastrophes on a large scale, the situation in Iran is further exacerbated under the government of Taqiyya (deceit), lies and hypocrisy, in the name "'unifying' the different sects". Yet it simultaneously slaughters the Sunni scholars and casts their dissected and mutilated corpses into the streets and the garbage dumps. Whereas the plight of Muslims is broadcasted internationally, no TV station or newspaper dares to highlight the case of Sunnis in Iran. Ahlus Sunnah are deprived of their basic civil, social, and human rights, not to mention the right of political participation and equality with the Shi'ah. The erection of a Sunni school or mosque in Iran is regarded as an unpardonable crime. Many Sunni Muslims, who supported such projects (even if it were in the past), were imprisoned, killed, or had their beard shaved for merely contributing to the building of a mosque or to any simple activity relating to Ahlus Sunnah. There are also hundreds of periodical prisoners and many killed purely on suspicion. The following are only some of the names of the prominent scholars who have been kidnapped, poisoned, or killed:

1. Bahman Shakoury was amongst the prominent scholars of his area, Tonalis, and was active in Da'wah within intellectuals. He was arrested and convicted with Wahhabism and executed in 1986.
2. Sheikh Mawlawi Abdul Aziz was one of the elite leaders of Ahlus Sunnah who played a prominent role in opposing the Constitution in matters relating to Ahlus Sunnah rights. He was the director of the religious school of Zahdan and the chief of Baluchi armed tribes. He was poisoned in 1987.
3. Sheikh Abdul Wahhab Khafi played a notable role in exposing the calamities of Ahlus Sunnah outside Iran, especially in Pakistan. He was killed in 1990 under torture after being accused with Wahhabism.
4. Sheikh Nasser Sabhani was one of the leaders of Sunnah in Kurdistan who conducted many educational courses. He was arrested after refuting the false accusations of kufr directed at Umar (r.a.a) by Khomeini in his famous book 'al-Hukumah al-Islamiah' (The Islamic Government). He was killed in 1992 in prison and his relatives were denied from witnessing his funeral and the prayer.
5. Dr. Ali Muzhaffaryan was amongst the eminent intellectual Shi'ites who was a cardiac surgeon and the head of Shiraz Committee of Physicians. He embraced the school of Ahlus Sunnah wa al-Jamma'ah and then converted his house to a mosque because the government of Shiraz did not permit the establishment of mosques. He was arrested and convicted with Wahhabism and American treachery and tortured severely when many Shi'ite youth followed him into Sunnism. He was later released only to be assassinated in 1992.

Moreover, the following are some of Ahlus Sunnah's mosques and Islamic schools that were destroyed:

6. Al-Sunnah mosque in Ahwaz. The first Sunni mosque to be confiscated before war with Iraq. It was transformed to a security police centre.
7. South of Tehran. The second Sunni mosque to be confiscated was in 1982.
8. Tareeth Ham mosque. This mosque is in the state of Kharasan. It was transformed to a centre for the revolutionary guard.
9. School and mosque of Lakour. It is situated near the city of Jabahar in Baluchistan state. The government demolished the mosque and the school in 1987 under the accusation that it was a center for Wahhabis.
10. Al-Sunnah mosque in Shiraz. Confiscated after the murder of Dr. Muzaffar Ban who founded it, and transformed to a centre for selling video and audio tapes produced by the revolutionary guard.
11. Sheikh Faydh mosque. This is an ancient Sunnah mosque in Mashhad, one of the main Shi'ah centres of the world. The government could not tolerate the continued existence of this mosque in the city, so it demolished it in 1993, under the supervision of the revolutionary guard, who also demolished adjoining centres which were used as guest houses and Qur'an memorisation centres. The demolition orders came from Khameni personally, the present spiritual leader of Iran. What is amazing is the fact that the demolition of this mosque occurred immediately after the government-sponsored demonstrations against the demolition of the Babary Mosque in India by the Hindus.
12. Ahlus Sunnah School, Talish. The government confiscated the Ahlus Sunnah school at Talish -North-West of Iran. Sheikh Quraishy, the principal of the school was also arrested and alleged confessions were obtained from him under torture.
13. Aaban mosque Mashhad city. They confiscated the land, demolished the walls, and expelled the trustee.
14. Repair of roads. They also repair the roads from time to time, eg. in the city of Zahdan, in order to demolish Sunnah houses, mosques and schools in the name of alleged reconstruction.

What in reality is the representation of Ahlus Sunnah in the various government posts in Iran such as parliament, ministries, etc?

This is an important question. Ahlus Sunnah, who compose approximately one third of the Iranian population, have in all honesty no representation at all. In fact, the situation has reached a stage of oppression and deprivation where Ahlus Sunnah no longer contest these posts and are satisfied with looking to satiate their food needs without being prosecuted. There is no Sunni director in any of the government authorities, ministries, embassies, or local and provincial governments, hospitals or principalities; not even in the lowest government posts anywhere in Iran. There are some Sunni parliamentarians just like in most Middle Eastern countries, however, these are token positions so that the common people can be fooled. Before a person's political nomination is accepted in Iran, he must be approved, by law, by the security agencies which naturally reject any Sunni activist, even if this person was to somehow attempt to appease them. These agencies employ the lowest form of people, and the most vile. This means that even if someone was elected by the people, the council has the right to ostracise him from Government. So of what use is such a parliament, especially with respect to the Sunni parliamentarian who does not have a party to protect him? Even if he obtained such a post, what could he possibly offer his people? The whole council therefore has no practical value. This is supported by Khomeini's address to Mawlawi Abdul Aziz after the Iranian revolution: "We do not have a shura process, the principle with us is that the Imam rules, and imitators follow suit. We took the idea of a council from your creed, for this reason, you will not find any value placed on a council." This is a great shame. Whilst we are living in the twentieth century, we find a third of the population of a nation deprived of their most basic rights. Is there any other country on the face of the earth which prevents its people from choosing names like Umar, A'ishah, Hafsah, Abu Bakr, Zubair, or most of the names of the companions amongst the ten foretold of Paradise?

Do Ahlus Sunnah have an organised movement? What is the extent of its popularity? And how are Ahlus Sunnah facing the present situation?

Ahlu Sunnah had organised movements at the outset of the revolution, when parties were still present. However, when the government became stronger, they prohibited all the Salafi groups. The danger of the Sunni groups was obvious, amongst these was the central shura council for Ahlus Sunnah, the Kurdistan movement for equal rights, the Union of Muslims in Baluchistan, the Majdia. movement in Zahran, and others. The funds of these groups were confiscated and presently, there are no openly organised Sunni groups. In fact, the Sunnis in Iran are deprived of rights which are freely given even to the disbelievers, such as charities to care for the orphans and the widows and others.

As for dealing with the present situation, we are currently only able to offer patience and to take one blow after another. They are like the orphans - they do not have a government to defend them or to dare to mention their plight except on special occasions. They do not have a Sunni group outside of Iran to sponsor them apart from what we initiated a few years ago here (in London).

Do you expect any change in the policies of the present government towards Ahlus Sunnah after the election of Khatemy?

There is a minor change in the policy of the government towards us. Khatemy is not blood thirsty and does not like the shedding of blood nor the stealing of our money as did Khameni and Rafsanjany. Khatemy has changed many of the blood thirsty officials in the Sunni areas with other Shi'ah who are not as blood thirsty. However, he was not brave enough to appoint one Sunni official. Had Khatemy taken this opportunity, the tyranny and oppression would be reduced dramatically, however, I do not think that he intends or is able to bring equality between Sunni and the others. I have sent an open letter to him in this respect.

What is the policy of Ahlus Sunnah for their future dealings with this situation? Does the declaration of the Afghan Islamic Emirate have any effect on the internal situation?

Our policy with this bitter reality is to be patient and abstain from armed conflict. We do not wish to repeat the experiment in Hama, Halab, Tripoli and others which were very bitter experiments. Particularly as we know that there is no government, or even an organisation which dares to or intends to support or sponsor us.

Yes, the existence of a Sunni Muslim government in Afghanistan will have a definite effect on us. This is why we are witnessing every effort from Iran to halt the establishment of an Islamic government in Afghanistan. The minister for Iranian foreign affairs declared a number of years before: "We will never permit the establishment of a Wahhabi government in Afghanistan". In the view of these devils, any Sunni government is a Wahhabi government. In summary, the existence of any Sunni government is in our interest. It is notable to bear in mind that the Shi'ah/Safawi State which existed during the Ottoman rule fell at the hands of the Afghan Sunnis.

Is there a message to other Sunni Muslims throughout the world from their brothers in Iran?

We see ourselves as credal and intellectual extensions of our brothers. What we are facing today is a direct result of our affiliation to the Ahlus Sunnah creed and for no other reason. It is the responsibility of the Muslims in every organisation as groups and as individuals to be concerned over their religion and their faith. We know the reason for the backdown of the authorities and the governments, however, what excuse could there be

for the charities, wealthy Muslims, Islamic organisations, and groups? They do not have an excuse before Allah.

I also have a parting word for those who share our creed who visit Iran regularly. We hardly find any of them any concern towards their religion and the people of their creed. I advise these people to be conscious of Allah and have some concern for their creed and those who subscribe to the same creed. Their visits are proof against us and cause us harm and lead to the murder of many of our members. They are like puppets in the hands of the political regime, they say to us: "Here are your Imams, your scholars and Sheikhs, they are praying behind us, visiting the grave of the Imam, and do not ask for a separate mosque for themselves in Tehran, they say we pray all together in one mosque, so why do you differ with your scholars? You must be Wahhabi!"

Finally we thank Nida'ul Islam magazine for their attention and concern with our plight, we pray for their success.

Iran And The Revolution

An Exposure Of The American Plans

Contents

Part 1: Iran and the Revolution

- [Roots of U.S - Iranian Relationship](#)
- [Mussadiq, U.S & U.K](#)
- [U.S Strengthens its foothold in Iran](#)

Part 2: Iran and the Revolution

- [Why the need for the Revolution](#)
- [Khomeini's role in the Revolution](#)
- [The U.S - Khomeini Relationship](#)
- [Evidence from Shah's Memoirs](#)
- [Al-Watan Newspaper](#)

Part 3: Iran and the Revolution

- [Bazargan's attitude towards U.S](#)
- [Hasan Habibi](#)
- [Iran - Iraq War](#)
- [Dual Containment](#)

Part 4: Iran and the Revolution

- [Conclusion](#)

References

Part 1: Iran And The Revolution

"To break the deadlock over compensation to Anglo-Iranian, the US and Britain agreed to accept the principle of Iranian ownership of its oil resources. In return, Iran ceded production and marketing rights which were given a consortium, including 40 percent US participation, that formally ended Britain's oil monopoly in Iran. With the establishment of the Iranian consortium, the US was now the

major player in the oil, and the volatile politics, of the Middle East."

The involvement of the colonial powers in the Middle East politically and culturally is evident. On the surface it may appear to some that the West interferes and manipulates the internal affairs of the third world countries to spread their "democratic" values, but the bottom line is imperialism.

As Muslims, it is our obligation to realize and understand how international affairs are controlled and how countries such as the US, Britain, and France have a direct influence on our land. In this article we will examine US involvement in Iran, observing the events such as the oil crises in the 50's, the Mussadiq affair, the revolution, the Iran-Iraq war, and the current US policy towards Iran.

A Brief Historical Overview

Historically, US in the beginning had cultural ties with not just Iran, but with the entire Middle East. Until World War II the missionary efforts in Lebanon, Syria and Iran, extending back into the early years of the 19th Century. While, this served the only continuing American interest in the region. Missionaries had made few converts from amongst the Muslims. They did, however, establish schools and colleges to train leaders which served as their catalysts.

In the 1930's American oil companies entered Bahrain, Kuwait and Saudi Arabia. During World War II, US did become involved politically, especially in Saudi Arabia. The meeting between President Franklin D. Roosevelt and King Abd al-Aziz Ibn Saud in the Great Bitter Lake at Suez in February 1945 symbolized this concern.²

However, before World War II the relationship between the United States and Iran were cordial but distant. The United States had established diplomatic relations with Iran in 1856, but did not send a diplomat of ambassadorial rank until 1944. However, during the late 1800s and early 1900s, the US did have missionaries, teachers and archaeologists in Iran. With the World War II raging in Europe, Britain and the Soviet Union jointly invaded Iran in September 1941 to establish a supply route to the Soviet army. The invading forces quickly overpowered the Iranian army and forced Reza

Shah out of power, who had established relations with the Germans. Reza Shah was replaced by the British by his twenty one year old son, Muhammad Reza Pahlvi, the late Shah.³ Following the US entry into the war, the United States sent troops to Iran in conjunction with the supply operation, initiating a period in which US-Iranian relations grew rapidly.

Roots Of US - Iranian Relationship

In 1942, US established two military missions to balance the British and Russian presence. Of the two military missions, the US Mission to the Iranian Gendarmerie (GENMISH) was by far more important than the US Mission to the Iranian Army (ARM1[SH]). Under Article 20 of the agreement between Iran and the US in 1943, the head of GENMISH exercised executive control over the internal security force of 25,000 men. He reported directly to the minister of the interior in Tehran.⁴ Brigadier General Norman H. Norman Schwarzkopf, (father of the Gulf War general Schwarzkopf) was the head of GENMISH and the Gendarmerie. He was appointed to the post in Tehran by Roosevelt. Schwarzkopf virtually ruled the large Iranian force of internal security police (SAVAK). The Gendarmerie took part in the pre-conquest of Azerbaijan in December 1946, which was under Soviet Union control.⁵ Schwarzkopf, to say the least, became a powerful man. In 1947, he confidently wrote that by the end of 1948 (when the Gendarmerie agreement was to expire) he expected to have the force sufficiently organized to make American command (military) unnecessary. During an audience with the Shah, Schwarzkopf insisted on the need to increase the Gendarmerie to 40,000 men, and when the monarch expressed fear that the force would become the private army of the prime minister, he replied that the nation required such a force because his men had to do much of the work of the army in Azerbaijan and among the tribes.⁶ The general even had control of the Iranian Majlis, by having 88 votes in it. He boasted this to Wiley, the US ambassador to Iran.⁷

In 1947 and 1948, the US embassy staff grew considerably in size, enhancing diplomatic, commercial and cultural interactions between the two nations. More importantly, the Office of Strategic Services, the predecessor to the CLN established a station in the Tehran's military attaches and embassy political officers. These covert operations included intelligence-gathering and propaganda operations aimed at the Soviet Union and its allies in Iran, cross-border espionage and subversion raids into Soviet territory, and efforts to map out escape and evasion routes and organize "stay-behind" guerrilla networks for use in the event of a Soviet invasion. Although these operations were all aimed ultimately at the Soviet Union, they did have the effect of straightening or weakening various Iranian political actors during this period⁸ Consequently, an increasing US involvement in the internal affairs of the country was becoming evident. This fact becomes evident in the Mussadiq affair, the revolution and in the general setup and direction of Iran.

Mussadiq, US, And UK

In the late 1940s, unrest began growing steadily among the politically active in Iran, but mainly by the help of the Americans. This was because of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Company (AIOC), a British-owned firm which was earning large profits from its monopoly over Iran's oil industry. In October of 1949, a group of prominent political figures established an organization known as the National Front to press for political reforms and nationalization of the AIOC's assets in Iran. The National Front became extremely popular and managed to elect eight of its members to the Majlis in late 1949 which was greatly influenced by the American General Schwarzkopf. The National Front was led by Muhammad Mussadiq, a charismatic Majlis deputy from a wealthy land owning family who had established a reputation as an ardent nationalist and democrat. By all accounts, it seems that Mussadiq was brought into power with the American help. This is due to many reasons such as:

Britain had oil monopoly in Iran and Mussadiq called for the end to this by calling for nationalization of the oil industry.

Mussadiq was from a prominent land owning family from prominent tribes. As mentioned earlier, Schwrtzgopf had already been working with many of the tribes to prepare them to take a more active role in the Iranian government.

The US government during this period had renewed their global strategy of containing Soviet's influence. It concluded that a major effort had to be made in Iran to prevent Tudeh Party (communist) from coming to power and delivering Iran into the Soviet hands. The answer to communist was the nationalist Mussadiq.

Razmara, predecessor to Mussadiq was brought in by America's blessing and turned anti-American.⁹ Therefore, Razmara was assassinated. After the assassination, the Majlis nominated Mussadiq for the primership. As stated above, Schwarzkopf, the American General had said that he had considerable influence over the Majlis.

After Mussadiq assumed office, the Truman administration publicly expressed strong support for him. Recognizing that he could serve an effective alternative to the Tudeh Party. "Washington concluded that Iran must be kept in the Western camp at all costs because of its strategic location and that a protracted oil crisis might weaken the US economy and threaten US and Western security. Accordingly, for the remainder of Truman's term in office the administration pursued a policy of supporting Mussadiq, opposing British efforts to overthrow him, and attempting to mediate an agreement that would satisfy both parties to the oil dispute and minimize disruption of the world oil market." ¹⁰

US brought Mussadiq to power, so that US would obtain their share of oil wealth from Iran. During the same period, the US had already reached an agreement with Saudi Arabia for sharing the oil resources based on a 50-50 plan. ¹¹ After coming to power, the first thing Mussadiq did was to nationalize the oil on April 29, 1951. Nationalization of the oil posed threat to Britain's weak economy and dwindling prestige, so the nationalization decree initiated a confrontation between Britain and Iran. This led Britain to start covert operations in Iran, none of which succeeded. Britain then persuaded major world oil companies to boycott Iranian oil exports. The British also imposed a

series of bilateral economic sanctions on Iran and began an ominous military buildup in the region. In September 1951, British officials began implementing a plan to invade southwestern Iran and seize the oil fields. When US officials were told about this plan, President Truman notified British Prime Minister Clement Attlee that the US would not support an invasion and urged him to resume negotiations with Iran over the oil dispute. As a result, Attlee was forced to abandon the invasion plan, telling his cabinet that "in view of the attitude of the United States government, [he did not] think it would be expedient to use force" in Iran. 12 Soon after the oil nationalization law was enacted, US officials began to implement a plan to ease the effect of the British oil blockade on the world oil market. Under this plan US oil companies were asked to provide oil to US allies that had been adversely affected by the blockade. Although this effort was intended to help stabilize the world oil market, it also reinforced the oil blockade and therefore inadvertently helped to weaken the Iranian economy and undermine Mussadiq's popular support. At the same time, US officials began a concerted effort to facilitate a negotiated settlement of the oil dispute. They advised the British to accept nationalization of the AIOC and agree to a 50/50 division of profits with Iran. However, the attempt failed.

US Strengthens Its Foothold In Iran

A few months later, US was able to strike a secret deal with Shah's sister, Princess Ashraf.

In the deal, Iran conceded production and marketing rights which were given to a consortium, including 40% US participation. This formally ended the British oil monopoly in Iran.¹³ After the deal was reached by the Americans, **the CIA** officers in Tehran began to turn some of their anti-Soviet covert operations in directions that undermined Mussadiq's base of support. Under a propaganda operation code-named BEDAMN, they distributed newspaper articles and cartoons that depicted Mussadiq as corrupt and immoral and portrayed him as exploiting Aytullah Kashani. They provided financial assistance to certain clergymen to drive them away from Mussadiq. CIA officers had long-standing ties to the Pan-Iranist Party and the Toiler's Party (both had strongly supported Mussadiq) made efforts to turn these organizations against Mussadiq. In a particular noteworthy case, two CIA officers in the **fall of 1952** approached Baqai, who had headed the Toiler' Party, encouraging him to break with IRAN ARTICLE FROM KHALIFORNIA Page 6 of 7

Mussadiq and giving him money. Similar approaches may have been made to Kashani, Makki, and other prominent figures.¹⁴ By November 1952 both the Pan-Iranists and Toilers Party had split into pro and anti-Mussadiq factions; Kashani, Makki, Baqai, and other National Front leaders had openly turned against Mussadiq, thanks to the heavy covert efforts by the CIA. Hand in hand with the CIA, the British were carrying out very similar, but more extensive covert activities against Mussadiq. Christopher Montague Woodhouse, who had been heading British intelligence operation in Iran, was sent to Washington in November to present US officials with a plan to oust Mussadiq.¹⁵ The plan called for a coordinated uprising to be engineered by the Rashidians and certain Bakhtiari tribal elements, with or without the Shah's approval. On February 3, 1953, two weeks after the Eisenhower inauguration, top US and British officials met in Washington and made a decision to develop and carry out a plan to work together in order to overthrow Mussadiq. By using the BEDAMN network, CIA carried out extensive propaganda barrage against Mussadiq and organized antigovernment and anti-Tudeh demonstrations, adding considerably to the turmoil that was engulfing Tehran. They sought the support of top military officers, arranging to have certain army units participate in the coup.

Finally, Mussadiq fell in August of 1953. With Mussadiq out of the way, the Eisenhower administration rushed to support General Zahedi, who had already been chosen to replace Mussadiq as the prime minister. The US provided Iran with \$68 million, amounting to roughly one third of the total revenue Iran had lost as a result of the British oil embargo. Over \$300 million in additional US economic aid was given to Iran during the next ten years. The United States also began a major effort to strengthen Shah's security forces soon after the coup, reorganizing and training his domestic intelligence apparatus and giving him almost \$600 million in military assistance during the next decade.¹⁶ As a result, Iran's economy grew rapidly. With the more effective security apparatus in place, Shah consolidated his grip on power in the late 1950s and early 1960s. By late 1963, this process had been completed: Shah presided over an authoritarian, repressive regime under which organized opposition to his authority was not tolerated, and there seemed little chance

that he would fall from power.

For twenty six years, Iran was a virtual colony of the US corporations and the Pentagon. During these years, the process of Iran's integration into the global capitalist market dominated by the US was consolidated. Iran's role, along with other countries in the region was to deliver cheap oil and receive mostly finished consumer commodities.

1 George D. Moffett III, Christian Science Monitor, March 20, 1991.

2 James Goode, The United States and Iran, 1946-51.

3 David Lesch, The Middle East and the United States, page 52.

4 Ibid., page 24.

5 John Waller Interview, December 1982, RG59, 891.105A/2 July 1948, Wiley to Henderson.

6 RG 319, Plans and Operations Division (P&O), o91 Iran, eLettersi 17 February 1947, Schwarzkopf to Colonel Pottenger.

7 James Goode, The United States and Iran, 1946-51.

8 Rouhollah K. Ramazani, Iran's Foreign Policy, 1941-1973: A study of Foreign Policy in Modernizing Nations (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1975) PP. 159-162; Confidential interview conducted by Mark Gasiorowki with several CIA officers stationed in Iran during this period.

9 James Goode, The United States and Iran, 1946-51, page 83.

10 NSC, The position of the United States with Respect to Iran, NSC 107/2, June 27, 1951.

11 James Goode, The United States and Iran, 1946-51, Page 89.

12 Henry Byroade, interview by Mark Gasiorowski, Potomac, Maryland, August 7, 1984; Record of Interdepartmental Meeting, March 20, 1951, Foreign Office 371/91525.

13 George D. Moffett III, Christian Science Monitor Date, March 20, 1991.

14 Elm, Oil, Power, and Principle, pp. 244-246; confidential interviews conducted by Mark Gasiorowski with several CIA officers from that era.

15 Talk about why US and Britain worked together??????chk with AT

16 Mark Gasiorowski, US Foreign policy and the Shah, Ch. 4.

[Back to top](#)

Part 2: Iran And The Revolution

Why The Need For The Revolution?

Since Shah was serving America's interest so well, the question comes to mind is why he was

removed from power. Was there a sincere and honest to goodness revolution which brought Khomeini to power? In this section we will demonstrate that it was the United States who used Khomeini and his colleagues to oust the Shah.

The American administration, under President Carter, charged that the CIA had failed in its mission to protect the Shah. However, such a claim must be completely rejected because, as mentioned in the previous sections that there were more than 40,000 American military advisors in Iran who worked in the Ministries of the Interior and Foreign Affairs, as well as in the security offices (SAVAK), and the oil companies. These advisors had the most sophisticated spying devices and were free to move within Iran as well as in the Gulf region. They also constituted one seventh of the Iranian army. For every F-14 and F-15, there was an American advisor. Then, how can anyone believe that what happened in Iran was a surprise to the CIA? A more convincing theory is that the CIA wanted to remove Shah from power. There are several reasons that support this claim:

Shah wanted to build an empire that he claimed would be the sixth greatest power in the world. To make his dream a reality, he wanted to buy the most modern and sophisticated weapons in the world. To accomplish this, the Shah spent more than \$20 billion in the military field. This was a great concern for the U.S. because this would create an imbalance between Iran and its neighbors. Such a point was mentioned in the documents seized from the Embassy, right after the revolution. One of these documents stated that the Iranian military buildup would have serious consequences on the future cooperation between Iran and Saudi Arabia, which the U.S. at that time was supporting. 17 This relationship was strategically important in securing the Gulf region. In addition, the Iranian arms buildup might have forced Iraq to move closer to the Soviet Union for protection and armaments, which consequently could have increased the rise in armaments in the region, jeopardizing U.S. efforts to have a friendly relationship with Baghdad. 18

Shah visited the USSR and met with some of leaders by his initiative, which angered the U. S. America's patience ran out when Shah began dealing with the Americans as an independent partner. In an interview with U.S. News & World Report, Shah said that if the U.S. would take an unfriendly attitude towards Iran, then Iran "can hurt you (U.S.) as badly, if not more so, than you can hurt us (Iran). Not just through oil, we can create trouble for you in the region. If you force us to change our friendly attitude, the repercussions will be immeasurable."19

Concern over Shah's attitude towards the oil policies, which differed from America's point of view. This was another point mentioned in the seized documents from the American Embassy in Tehran.

Therefore, how would US remain silent when a third world leader was revolting? In an interview with Muhammed Hasanayn Heikal, the Egyptian Journalist, Shah said, "Some people accuse me of being an American puppet, but give me one reason why I should accept such a role You have no idea the number of clashes I have had with the Americans. The last of these was over OPEC. The Americans wanted to break it up from the inside and tried to do so. The Saudis were terrified. It was I who had to bear the brunt of the confrontation. I can exercise power on my own. Why should I want to exercise power on behalf of somebody else?"20 The CIA, as it is well known, had brought Shah back to power, after Mussadiq, and protected him for twenty-seven years. The entire American presence in Iran was in danger and for U.S. this was a life-and-death issue.

Shah was quiet aware of the CIA's involvement in his country. He said, in a private conversation with some American visitors, that he received some reports that the Americans were involved with a few oil companies during some of the most recent riots in the country. Shah said in an interview with Dean Brellis and Parvis Raeim from Time Magazine that the CIA began making contact within dissident ranks fifteen years ago so that the U.S. would have influence with anyone who might manage to overthrow him.2 1 Also, he said that "if he left the throne, thousands would die in the ensuing fight," and if that happened, he feels that "Communist forces would take control of what would then be a bankrupt and fragmented country.~22 When Shah became sixty years old, he did not have a strong party to inherit his policies. The people wanted him out because of corruption, though many had valued the things he did. They wanted somebody else to lead them. The strongest alternative to Shah was Khomeini, especially during a time when Islam became a hot topic in the region. Shah accused the CIA of being behind the plot to get rid of him and of having strong relations with his opposition. While, Khomeini was the head of that opposition.

Khomeini's Role In The Revolution

Can it be right what Shah said? How can anybody believe this accusation and at the same time believe in the asceticism which surrounded Khomeini? First, we would like to mention Khomeini ideological understanding. He says about Tuqi'a (dissimulation),

which means "legitimacy to lie if it is beneficial." Additionally, Khomeini said: "If the circumstances of Tuqi'a forces anyone of us to enter the Sultan's doors, we should not do it even if it causes murder, unless his seeming treachery causes a real victory for Islam and the Muslims like the treachery of Ali bin Yekteen and Nasir ad-Deen Tusi."²³ Thus, Khomeini took Tusi as the ideal figure to follow. Tusi, as every Muslim should know, was the Vizir of the Criminal Holakou. Tusi guided Holakou to the Baghdad massacres some seven hundred years ago. If Khomeini considered Tusi as a role model then what's the big deal for him to have a relationship with US?

Khomeini added: "...it is natural that Islam permit us to enter the Tyrant's establishments if the real aim is to stop oppression or to make a coup de'tat. Against the people in power, this "treachery" will be mandatory, and there is no doubt about it."²⁴ It is obvious that Khomeini saw the deal and cooperation with the enemies of the Muslims as mandatory if it benefited his sector. As a result, Khomeini claimed that it was permissible for Tusi to serve the Tartar invaders and used it to justify his cooperation between him and the CIA on the notion that it was beneficial for him and his country.

Some would still find it hard to believe that Khomeini had a relationship with the Americans while attacking the US at the same time? In this regard, we should remind ourselves of Abdul Nasser who used to badmouth U.S. in the media and U.S. would do the same. However, Nasser was a US puppet. Miles Copeland, the CIA operative in the region, used to write his speech in which he heavily criticizes the U.S. along with making the announcement to buy arms from Czechoslovakia.²⁵ From this, we can see how a leader from the Third World can appear to be an enemy of the U.S. but in reality is a puppet. Consequently, American agents can wear several masks and we have to be aware of this.

The US - Khomeini Relationship

There are tremendous amounts of information which link Khomeini with the Americans. He served their agenda and purpose regardless of his intention. The American influence in the region was deeply rooted and remains until today. US-Khomeini relationship is obvious based upon the following evidences:

Intro. To the following meeting especially the Bruce

1. By the late 1978, many in the Embassy and in the State Department were convinced that the Shah could not last and were in contact with secular and religious figures that might enter a governmental position²⁶. Shah sent a leek to the Iraqi government accusing the CIA of what happened in Iran, telling Iraq that the U.S. was trying to change the political systems in the region by using religion and that Baghdad's turn would be next. The Shah asked Iraq to watch Khomeini more closely because he had

connections with the CIA. Some news from the Iranian Palace accused the former Information Minister, Dayrysh Homayun, of publishing an article in Ettala'at violently attacking Khomeini and of having a connection with the CIA, which ordered the distribution of this article and initiated the riots against the Shah as a result.²⁷ All of this gave Khomeini great amount of publicity.

Note: give background info of what the dialogue really means do not leave it up to the reader to assumed that his is an agent. Also mention the dialogue was continuous not just once or twice.

On January 21, 1979, the former Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, arrived in Paris from Tehran. He held some talks with the opposition leader Khomeini and told him Carter's opinions of the recent events. As the news agencies reported, when Clark left Khomeini, he said, "I have a great hope that

this revolution will bring social justice to Iranian people." 28

An interview with the Sudanese leader, Sadeq Al-Mehdi, in Al-Mostaqbal magazine, convinces us that the American administration used him as a mediator in the hostage crisis by visiting Khomeini. He added that this was not the first time he mediated between the American administration and Khomeini.²⁹

Former Iranian Foreign Minister, Ibrahim Yazdi, said in a conversation with the Iranian newspaper, Iyanadjan, which Reuter broadcasted on August 7, 1979, that Carter warned Khomeini to be careful, if Bakhtiar did not support the Revolution. This warning was in a letter which two French presidential envoys carried to Khomeini in exile on Neauphle Le Chateau in France. What is important here is the letter and the warning which Carter gave to Khomeini.

NBC news reported that Sheikh Al-Islam Reza Al-Shirazy, one of the religious figures in Iran, had secret medical treatment for four months in Minnesota. The network reported that Al-Shirazy was wounded in an assassination attempt in July 1979. A speaker of the State Department said that there is no relation between Al-Shirazy and the Revolutionary Council in Iran, but he is a friend of Khomeini. However, the network did not report whether Shirazy left the U.S. at that time.³⁰ Why was the U.S. so loyal to Khomeini while he held some American hostages? And how did the Americans know the names of the Revolutionary Council while we know the names were secret?

5. The Meeting between Bruce Laingen and Khomeini Laingen, the American Charge D' Affairs in Tehran, held three meetings with Khomeini in Qom in mid-August, 1979. He also held a fourth meeting with him in Tehran while Khomeini was making a short visit there. Right after the meeting, the riots took place in Ahwas that reduced the oil supply, and the result was a shortage in the gasoline supply. The U.S. then supplied the needs of Iran, and Congress, at that time, uncovered the secret deal.

At the same time, the Kurdish revolt occurred, which made Tehran import the spare parts and equipment from the U.S. to operate their fighter planes and troop carriers. Al-Watan Al-Arabia magazine from Paris stated that the first meeting between Laingen and Khomeini took place in Qom, accompanied by revolutionary guards, and that Laingen was carrying a file about the Kurdish revolt and the financial support of the Kurds by Russia. The magazine added that the Iranian cargo planes used Madrid as a refueling station on the trip between the U.S. and Iran to carry the spare parts, after an eight-month cut in the supply.³¹

Furthermore, Yazdi confirmed in an interview with the Associated Press, that there were talks with the American government about sending spare parts for at least part of the military equipment, as he stated, which Iran had, and these parts did arrive in Iran.³² On August 11, 1979, The Daily Telegraph said that there was a termination of the U.S. arms deals except those for spare parts.

There is no doubt that there was mediation between the U.S. and Khomeini via Al-Mehdi and Clark, or via the French envoys from the presidential office of the French Republic. From this news, there is clear evidence about the connections between Carter the "Satan" and Khomeini the "Angel." At this point, we would like to cite three pertinent sources:

Some declarations from the Shah; Khomeini's partners who disagreed with him after the Revolution succeeded; the Kuwaiti newspaper, Al-Watan.

Evidence From Shah's Memoirs

Shah said in his memoirs, that he did not know about Deputy Commander of U.S. Forces in Europe General Huyser's arrival in Tehran until a few days after its occurrence. Shah also said that this was strange because the General "had come to Tehran a number of times, scheduling his visits well in advance to discuss military affairs with me and my generals."³³ However, this arrival was secret. Shah stated that his generals did not know anything about his arrival. He continued by saying:

"As soon as Moscow learned of Huyser's arrival, Pravada reported, '**General Huyser** is in Tehran to foment a military coup.' In Paris, the International Herald Tribune wrote that Huyser had not gone to Tehran to 'foment' a coup **but to 'prevent' one.**"³⁴

Shah added:

"Did such a risk exist? I do not believe so. My officers were tied to the Crown and to

the Constitution by an oath of loyalty, but the different American information services had perhaps solid reasons to think that the Constitution would be abused. It was therefore necessary to neutralize the Iranian army. It was clearly for this reason that General Huyser had come to Tehran."³⁵

Then Shah said:

"Huyser succeeded in winning over my last chief of staff, General Ghara-Baghi, whose later behavior leads me to believe that he was a traitor. He asked Ghara-Baghi to arrange a meeting for him with Mehdi Bazargan, the human rights lawyer who became Khomeini's First Prime Minister. The General informed me of Huyser's request before I left, but I have no idea of what ensued. I do know that Ghara-Baghi used his authority to prevent military action against Khomeini. He alone knows what decisions were made and the price paid. It is perhaps significant that although all my generals were executed, only General Ghara-Baghi was spared. His savior was Behdi Bazargan.

"By the time Huyser left Iran, the Army had been destroyed, and the Bakhtiar government he had supposedly come to save was in shambles."³⁶

Shah said that he met Huyser only one time during his visit to Tehran. He was accompanied by Sullivan, the American Ambassador. According to the Shah, the only thing they thought about was when he was going to leave Iran.³⁷

Shah said after the revolution:

"At the travesty of a trial which preceded the execution of General Rabbii, the Commander of the Iranian Air Force, the General told his 'judges' that General Huyser threw the Shah out of the country like a dead mouse."³⁸

Shah ended by saying that plans for his departure had been announced, "interestingly enough, on January 11 in Washington by U.S. Secretary of State Vance."³⁹

A Testimony From Khomeini's Partners

Among those who supported Khomeini were the National Front, Sanjabi, Feda'iyen, and Majahedian Khalq, and they all disagreed with Khomeini. The reporter Houde Al-Hocine from Al-Hawadess met with these people, and she reported an important story as follows:

"These new revolutionaries rejected Khomeini's revolution because they said the revolution carried America's blessing and they consider America as the force behind the fall of the Shah and therefore, were backing Khomeini. **They gave evidence by** saying that America's president Carter was against Shah since the beginning for these reasons:

1. The Shah was having a feud with the Democratic Party, and most of the members of Congress were against the Shah because the Shah considered himself a leading hawk from the OPEC and led the campaign of raising the oil prices.
2. After the coup in Ethiopia's, the U.S. was planning to take the initiative in Iran to protect its interests after the loss of her largest base in Asmara, Ethiopia. Shah was also getting old and the

Crown Prince was too young. Thus, the U.S. was looking for a solution that would protect American interests, either through the Pahlavi family or through someone else. The American interest was the important thing. Americans then noticed the Communist activities that began to take its position by organized terrorist activities. Also, they found that the Soviet Union was the only beneficiary from the situation to gain whatever natural resources they wanted from Iran, especially natural gas. Afghanistan invasion took place, as well as the incidents in the Horn of Africa and South Yemen. This made Iran under the mercy of the leftist wave. Therefore, the situation had to be salvaged.

A coup de'tat was not acceptable by the Iranian people. Therefore, the change had to be from the people who could be incited by a revolution that would depend on religion. Accordingly, the Americans looked for a religious personality that was Khomeini.

The Americans did not keep an eye on Yazdi, which meant that he did not need to be monitored. Also, it meant that they knew who were the influential personalities.

Huyser came to Iran and spent all of January there after Shahpour Bakhtiar's government was assembled to persuade the Shah to temporarily go into exile and to persuade the army not to rebel but instead to support Bakhtiar. They used Bakhtiar to deport the Shah.

As soon as the revolution was won, the army commander said that the American advisors should come back and the oil would be pumped once again to the Western countries, including the United States. As soon as the **American Embassy had been** attacked, Ibrahim Yazdi went by himself to stop it. (The Army Commander was Muhammed Waly Karny).

The American advisors paid their rent three months in advance for their houses when they left Iran.

There was an attempt to destroy Khomeini's movement on the night of February 11, but something unexplainable made the attempt fail. The army announced that it was standing neutral. This announcement changed the core of events. The orders were given to the army and to the Embassy's guards to drop their **weapons**.

Al-Watan Newspaper

The Al-Watan reported uncovered some secrets. One of them mentions that "the United States explicitly asked the army commanders and generals to take this attitude at the last moment, and the State Department urged Ambassador Sullivan to persuade the senior generals, as soon as possible, not to intervene in any offensive action and to announce their neutrality in the political feuds."

That is what happened and after the Air Force revolt, General Ghara-Baghi, whom the Shah spoke of in his memoirs, ordered his forces to return to their camps and to avoid more riots and new bloodshed. At the same time, on February 14, the general met with the army commander. They issued a communiqué that stated:

"To prevent disorder and bloodshed, the superior body of the army decided to keep neutral in the recent political feud, and for this reason, **an order was given** to all the soldiers to return to their units and barracks. The Ambassador said that the reason for this was the possibility of a dangerous conflict between the army and the people, and the fear that the leftist world infiltrates and benefit from the conflict between Khomeini and the army. It was also to preserve the strength of the army to play a future role similar to the role which 'Suharto' played in Indonesia or to the role the generals played in a coup in Chile against Salvador Allende. The Ambassador added that the United States might have resorted to a military coup de'tat if the revolution got out of hand and they failed to contain it."⁴⁰

17"Above the Doubt Documents -- Part II," Ministry of Islamic directive -- Iran. P. 195, document dated 1976.

18 Ibid.

- 19 A False Sense of Security will Destroy you, US News & World Report, March 22, 1976, p. 57-58.
- 20 Muhammad H. Heikal, Iran: The Untold Story (New York Pantheon Books, 1982), p. 108-109.
- 21 The Shah is Not Giving Up, Time, November 27, 1978, p. 35.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Ayatollah Khomeini, The Islamic Government, p.128.
- 24 **Ayatollah** Khomeini, Walgaht Al-Faqih, pp. 142-143.
- 25 Miles Copeland, The Game of Nations (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969), pp. 133-134.
- 26 Christian Science Monitor, December 6, 1978, p. 2.
- 27 Al-Hawadess, No. 1156, London, December 29, 1978, p.13.
- 28 Al-Hawadess, No. 1161, London, Feb. 3, 1979, p. 26.
- 29 Al-Mostaqbal
- 30 NBC News, January 19, 1980.
- 31 Al-Watan Al-Arabi, No. 139, October 11-17, 1979, p.32.
- 32 Al-Hawadess, No. 1183, London, July 10, 1979, p.47.
- 33 Muhammed Reza Pahlavi, Answer to History (New York: Stein & Day, 1980), pp. 172-173.
- 34 Ibid.
- 35 Ibid.
- 36 Muhammed Reza Pahlavi, Answer to History (New York: Stein & Day, 1980), pp. 172-173.
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Muhammed Reza Pahlavi, Answer to History (New York: Stein & Day, 1980), pp. 172-173.
- 40 Fashal Mohawlat Intelap Daid Al-Khomeini," Al-Watan, Kuwait, March 18, 1979, p. 1.

[Back to top](#)

Part 3: Iran And The Revolution

Divergent views about US-Iranian Relationship in US

There was a dispute in the U.S. between the two parties regarding the removal of Shah. The Republicans mainly opposed such a move. But, Carter and his aides supported Khomeini without any doubt, and here are some facts to show this: Time magazine published on March 5, 1979, a declaration from Carter responding to his opposition saying, "Those who argue that the U.S. could or should intervene directly to thwart these events are wrong about the realities of Iran."⁴¹ President Carter, in his memoirs *Keeping Faith*, talked about Huyser's mission to Iran by saying:

Huyser believed the military had made adequate plans to protect its the equipment and installations, and that it would stay off the streets. He had dissuaded some of its leaders from attempting a coup and from moving out of other parts of Iran into the more stable southern part."⁴² Furthermore, President Carter praised Khomeini's first Prime Minister by saying:

He and his predominantly Western-educated cabinet **members cooperated** with us. They protected our embassy, provided safe travel for General Philip C. Gast, who had **replaced** Huyser, and sent us a series of friendly messages. Bazargan announced publicly his eagerness to have good relations with the U.S. and said that Iran would soon resume normal oil shipments to all its customers."⁴³

President Carter also praised Khomeini when he said:

Khomeini sent his personal representative to see Secretary Vance to pledge increased friendship and cooperation, and to seek our assurance that we were supporting the new Prime Minister and a stable government. Despite the turmoil within Iran, I was reasonably pleased with the attitude of the Iranian government under Bazargan."⁴⁴

In an interview with the former Secretary of Defense Harold Brown had with CBS program, *Face the Nation*, he said that the Bazargan government was very helpful in trying to protect Americans in a difficult and unstable, dangerous situation. He added that America can work out friendly relations.⁴⁵ At that time, the assistant Secretary of State for Middle Eastern and South Asian Affairs Harold H. Sanders said in his report before the Middle East Committee: "The American interests did not change in Iran, and we have a strong interest to keep Iran a stable, free, and independent state."⁴⁶ It is true that the American interests in Iran did not change and that the American administration knows best about their interests, especially because they worship their interests. If their interests were in danger, they would take the proper type of action to do what is best about the matter as Carter stated earlier (see above). Leaders of the Republican Party, on the other hand, bitterly opposed. George Bush described Carter as a liar, and he noted that during Carter's visit to Iran on December 31, 1977, the former president said, "Iran, because of the great leadership of the Shah, is an island of stability in one of the more troubled areas of the world." Bush made a remark about this part of Carter's speech saying that Carter, "at the time, was giving the secret code to the CIA to start destroying Shah's authority." And, as we know, Bush was serving in the CIA, and he was familiar with their tactics.⁴⁷ On January 7, 1978, the first riots erupted in Iran. Nevertheless, there was a battle between Kissinger and Carter's National Security Advisor, Brzezinski. The first blamed the second of hatching a conspiracy against the Shah, and he criticized Carter's attitude towards the Shah, who served the American interests for more than 26 years. In an interview with *The Economist* on February 10, 1979, which then published a book, Kissinger, the former Secretary of State, showed his support for the Shah. He also showed that the American policy at that time was deliberately directed to oust the Shah.⁴⁸ As it is clearly evident from these sources --The Shah's memoirs, the accounts of Khomeini's partners, and the Kuwaiti newspaper *Al-Watan* -- Huyser neutralized the army, and it was not coincidence that different political figures agreed to blame the United States. This blame was reasonable to anybody who followed the core of events which came before Khomeini's victory.

Bazargan's Attitude Towards The United States

In the rest of this section, we would like to bring some proclamations from Bazargan about his country's attitude towards the West, his speech from Tehran radio voicing his opinion of the West, as well as a document from the students who held the hostages and found documents in the American Embassy. One of these documents shows that Bazargan was an agent of the United

States, but we believe that Khomeini intervened in favor of his friend, which pacified the students.

In a speech with the New York Times, Bazargan said that his government is willing to maintain a good relationship with the United States, and he renewed his apology about the attack on the American Embassy in Tehran during the first days of his government in office. Regarding the oil exports, Bazargan said that his country will begin exporting **soon to all** the world including the United States.⁴⁹

Islamic Republic Party (IRP) as an Agent of the U.S.

Hajuat Al-Islam Ali Tehrani, a religious figure in Mashad, sent a letter to Khomeini charging three Ayatollahs, among them Ayatollah Beheshti, the Secretary of the Revolution Council, of having a connection with the United States and attempting to take over the authority. Hajuat Al-Islam, in his letter, published in the Islamic Republic newspaper on January 19, 1980, charged Beheshti, Hash RaLsanjani, a former Minister of Interior (the current president), and Ali-Khameni, the former Imam of Tehran's Mosque and the current spiritual leader, of trying to seize the authority by nominating Jalaeddin Farsi to represent the IRP in the election. He also said that it is the students' duty to uncover the documents they found in the Embassy which will prove that these three figures are guilty together with Abbas Amir Entezam, the former government spokesman who was imprisoned as a spy for the United States.⁵⁰

Abbas Amir Entezam, one of key figure was known to be a CIA agent. After the occupation of the Iranian Embassy, some documents were discovered which confirmed his relationship with the CIA.⁵¹

Rouhani: "The Americans Gave Us the Green Light"

In an interview with Paris-Match magazine, Ayatollah Hamid Rouhani said:

"The army was in the hands of its 40,000 American advisors. From the moment when America gave the green light -- and I am convinced that America gave us the green light -- the army could no longer do anything except what it is doing today: An honorable fight in fidelity to its oath to the Shah. When it understands that it is face to face with a revolution and not just a riot, it will fall into the hands of the people."⁵²

Hasan Habibi

Habibi was the Revolution Council's spokesman, and once he was a nominee for the Iranian presidency. He has been accused by more than one organization in Iran, and his name was brought forth in Counter Spy magazine with the information that he had been called to the U.S. when he officially entered the CIA on May 15, 1963.⁵³

Ibrahim Yazdi

Yazdi studied for sixteen years in the United States, and he had both the American citizenship along with his Iranian citizenship (his wife and **children carried only the** American citizenship).⁵⁴ Yazdi was **formerly responsible for the activities and the** hostile demonstrations against the Shah when he visited the White House in November of 1977. The newspapers found it strange, at the time, that Carter did not take the **proper kind** of action against the demonstrators.⁵⁵

In a talk with the United States Press on March 1, 1979, Senator Jim Abu Rezk said that he gave Khomeini's representative, Ibrahim Yazdi, some political as well as non-political support in Washington. He also helped to free the students who had been arrested in the demonstration against the Shah on February 2, 1978. When Yazdi was the Foreign Minister, it was his idea of not cutting but improving relations with the U.S.⁵⁶ He also negotiated with some American figures to import some military spare parts. Yazdi, together with Bazar, an agent Brezezinski in Algiers in November 1, 1979, three days before the American Embassy had been taken over.

Yazdi is still active in Iran. He is the leader of the "liberation movement of Iran": an opposition movement working with in the system to give the Iranian system legitimacy.

As we can see, the high figures in the Iranian Revolution did have a connection with the United States. After all of this, how can we believe that the Revolution was clean. This is also reinforced from the Islamic point of view which forbids the Muslims to cooperate with the enemies of Allah, the enemies of Islam, and the enemies of the Muslims. Also, if we examine the Iranian Constitution, we will find that, although it is good for a Western country, it has no similarity to the Islamic Constitution which would define an Islamic country. We can criticize the Iranian Constitution from the Islamic perspective, but it is not the subject of this paper.

After all this evidence, how could anybody believe that Khomeini was an Islamic leader or that he was sent to bring justice? Some may argue that there were some polluted figures in the Revolution, that Khomeini did not **know, or that he knew about** them and tried to eliminate them. This is not the **first time in recent history that this** occurred, as when Nasser claimed to be the leader for the Arabs. The same thing happened in Iran, except that instead of Nasser carrying the slogan of Pan-Arabism, Khomeini carried the slogan of Islam.

Iran-Iraq War

The imperialist nations are always thinking ahead and they have to, to maintain their domination in the world. After bringing Khomeini to power, the US had already made a back up plan of bringing "secularist" to power, in case the revolution failed or got out of hands. However, the revolution succeeded. Now, the US had to control it, so that the situation did not get out of hands. In pursuing this policy, Iraq's Saddam Hussein was 'encouraged' to attack Iran. Saddam Hussein thought that the Iran "could not withstand an attack for long, because its air force was nonexistent. The army had a combat capability of zero, the navy 10 percent. The Iraqi were **not far of the mark**", Bani Sadr wrote in his book. Bani Sadr continues, "and had they [Iraqis] attacked then, would have had every chance of a rapid victory. But they **had not received the green** light from the United States."⁵⁷

Coming to power with the United States assistance⁵⁸, Khomeini was certain that no one would attack Iran. Saddam on the other hand was certain that the war would be a simple exercise. who put these ideas into their heads, Bani Sadr asks in his book.

In July of 1980, Carter's national security advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, had met Saddam Hussein . He prepared a report for Carter, "explaining that the Iran-Iraq war was consistent with American policy in the region."⁵⁹

On September 22, 1980, Iraq attacked Iran. Within hours, Iraqi tanks crossed Iranian borders at several points and the Iranian air bases were bombed. Iran was able to survive the initial Iraqi attacks and launched their own attacks after a few days. So, began the long 8 years of Iran-Iraq war, where Muslims were the only losers. Nearly 300,000 Muslims died, just from the Iran side.

For the American government, this is nothing new. The history has proven that they are able to wipe a whole race just for the measly worldly possession, such as the case with the American Indians. For the Persian Gulf, American strategy was simple, which was to destabilize the region, by having one boogie man. **Khomenie was a perfect man** for this job. In the end, it was the US economy which benefited from this policy of destabilization. The Saudi's stepped up oil production as a result of the war and thus made the 'black gold' cheap for the Americans.

To maximize their gain, the Americans supplied weapons to both Iran and Iraq. It was reported that "the US subsidiaries all around the world found Iran to be an excellent customer because the Mullah paid top market prices."⁶⁰

Initially, the US began to support Iraq with weapon and **intelligence in 1982, when it** appeared that Iran might be winning.⁶¹ The Regan administration secretly decided to provide highly classified intelligence to Iraq in the spring of 1982, while also permitting the sale of American-made arms to

Baghdad in a successful effort to help Saddam Hussein avert imminent defeat in the war with Iran, former intelligence and State Department officials say. The American decision to lend crucial help to Baghdad so early in the war came after American intelligence agencies warned that Iraq was on the verge of being overrun by Iran, whose army was bolstered the year before by covert shipment of American-made weapons. The New York Times and others reported last year that the Regan administration secretly decided shortly after taking office in January 1981 to allow Israel to ship several billion dollars worth of American arms and spare parts to Iran."⁶²

Iran was even forced to buy the American weapons, to defend against Iraq. The Americans urged Iraq to carry out air strikes deep inside Iran. The plan was conceived during the Iran-Iraq war as pressure tactic intended to force Iran to turn to the United States for sophisticated anti-aircraft weapons to repel the Iraqi attacks. The United States could then use its increased leverage with Iran to press Teheran to free

American hostages being held by pro-Iranian groups in Lebanon. When asked about this information, White House spokeswoman, Laura Mellilo, told Reuters 'This is nothing new.'⁶³

Americas objectives were being achieved by this war. There was a deliberate attempt to create no winners, no losers in order to keep the area destabilized. As a result, America was "gaining control of the revolution, control over OPEC was reestablished... Three other objectives described in the reports seized in the embassy were as yet unattained: using the Iran-Iraq war to gain a foothold in the Persian Gulf, stabilizing the regimes in the region, and establishing military bases for the American strike forces."⁶⁴ (This situation was early the Iran-Iraq war. However, as we know, these goals are now already achieved by the US.)

When it seemed like Iran was gaining an edge in the war, the Americans decided to go all out to help Iraq even overtly, because the United States did not want the revolution to get out of hand. To help Iraq, Washington removed it from the list of nations supporting terrorism, enabling trade with the US to resume. Agricultural Sales and export-import bank credits were restored, as were diplomatic relations. "The US also shared with Iraq, military intelligence on the deployment of Iranian forces. 'Operation Staunch', was launched to stem the flow of arms to Iran. Washington turned an indifferent eye toward allied arms deals with Baghdad."⁶⁵

In 1987, Iraq was becoming desperate. Saddam **Hussein used chemical weapons on** Iran. An important question comes to mind is that who provided Iraqis with technology and the know how to deliver these chemical weapons? [Band Sadr mentions in his book that, the Soviets and Germans supplied the plans and training, and the French sold them 40 percent of the guns So, where did the other 60 percent of the guns to deliver the chemical weapons come from?]

By now it was obvious that the United States wanted the war to end. Most of their objectives were being fulfilled. Now they wanted to get Saddam Hussien, who had been in the British camp to join the American camp, like Iran.

By mid-1987, the American Navy started escorting Kuwaiti tankers (bearing US flags) through the Strait of Hormz and punished Iran for interfering with the tankers. The same year an Iranian airliner was shot down, killing 290 Muslims. This was seen "as the precursor of other catastrophes. if Iran did not immediately agree to the cessation of hostilities."⁶⁶

On July 20, 1988 Iran accepted the cease-fire. After agreeing to **cease-fire agreement**, Khomeini declared publicly, I have sold my honor; I have swallowed the poison of defeat.ⁱ⁻⁶⁷

As expected, the Americans profited from both the war and its conclusion.

Dual Containment

It is well known that during and after the Iran-Iraq war, Americans **were building Iraq in hope** of making him the "police man" of the Gulf, or at least to deter Iran from taking any 'threatening'

moves. This strategy appeared in may State Department document beginning in the fall of 1988, but it did not appear in a major policy document until presidential National Security Directive NSD-26, signed by President Bush on October 2, 1988. The directive stated:

"Normal relations between tile US and Iraq world **serve our long-term interests and** promote stability in both the Gulf and the Middle East. **The United States government** should propose economic and political incentives for Iraq to moderate its behavior and to increase our influence with Iraq... [Also], we should pursue and seek to facilitate opportunities for US firms to participate in the reconstruction of the Iraqi economy... where they do not conflict with our non-proliferation .. objectives.... The US should consider sales of non-lethal forms of military assistance, e.g., training courses and medical exchanges."68

Policy of trying to build up Iraq to be the policeman failed miserably, leading to the Gulf 'war'. We are not going to discuss this war at any length, because it is out of the scope of the discussion. Seeing their failure, the US changed its policy from building up Iran or Iraq to "a strategy of dual containment". "This policy **departs from the past** US practice of helping to build ~,~ one of the countries in hopes of balancing the other's military and political influence" a US official said. He also said, "the new US objective is to ensure that both Iran and Iraq remain equally weak for an indefinite period. The [Clinton] administration's principal approach is to ensnare both **countries in a tight web** of international trade restrictions meant to deprive them of the income and **technology they need** to develop new armaments' pursue terrorism, foment revolutions or **intimidate** their neighbors."69

41 Iran Time Magazine, March 5, 1979.

42 Jimmy Carter, Keeping Faith: Memoirs of a President, New York: Bantam Books, **1982**, p. 449

43 Ibid., p. 450.

44 Ibid., p, 452.

45 "Face the Nation," CBS, February 25, I 979.

46 Al-Hawadess, No. 1 163, London, February 16, 1979, p.29.

47 Ibid.

48 Henry Kissinger, For the Record: Selected Statements, 1977-1980 (Boston: Little, Brown & Company, 198 I), pp. 17.- 187.

49 New York Times, February I 8, I 979, pp. 1, 14

50 Islamic Republic, January 19, 1980, p.2

51 "NVDI comments on Entezam A Test," FBIS, December 26, 1979, pp. Sup. 23-24

52 George Menant, Translation by Dr. Marshall Windmiller, "A interroge L'ayatollah Rouhani Chef de la communaute chiite d'Europe," Paris Match, No. 1550, February 19, 1979, pp. 64-65

53 John Kelly, "The CIA in the Middle East," Counter Spy, November/December 1978, p. 13

54 Al-Hawadess, No. 1171, p. 37.

55 Al-Nahan Arab and international, Paris, May 20, 1978.

56 Carter, p. 453

57 Bani Sadr, My Turn To Speak, Page 69.

58 Iran Times, October 20, 1989, Page 8., A quote by Richard **Cottam, an Iranian specialist** and a professor- at the University of Pittsburgh.

59 Ibid., page 70.

60 Newsday, March 20, 1991, Page 6.

61 Howard Teicher and Gayle Radley Teicher, Twin Pillars to Desert Storm: America's Flawed Vision in the Middle East from Nixon to Bush. (New York: William Morrow and Co. 1993.)

62 New York Times, Sunday, January 26, 1992.

63 Ibid., New Yorker Magazine, November 2, 1992.

64 Bani Sadr, My Turn To Speak, page 144.

65 Christian Science Monitor, June 3, 1992.

66 Bani Sadr, My Turn To Speak, page 214.

67 Bani Sadr, My Turn To Speak, page 215

68 The White House, presidential documents, Presidential Determination Number 90-7 of January 17, 1990, Application of export-import Bank Restrictions in Connection with Iraq, P. 1.

69 The Washington Post, Sunday, May 23, 1993.

[Back to top](#)

Part 4: Iran And The Revolution

Rafsanjani The Moderate

After Khomeini's death, the existing organizations will try to change the country, each in a different way. The people are aware of this, and **the United States will support any** government that restores freedom and democracy."70 These are the words of Ronald Regan. After reading this, it is easy to analyze where the current regime of Iran is headed.

After Khomeini's death, sure enough Hashemi Rafsanjani became the president. He is the current president. Although, according to the Iranian Constitution, a president can only serve two-4 year terms. But, since Rafsanjani is paving the way to moderation", the Iranian Majlis is in the process of changing the constitution so that Rafsanjani can become president for a third time. Rafsanjani has maintained contact with the Americans since the revolution. For example, back in December of 1986, "the Heritage Foundation mentioned a prospective rapprochement with the Khomeini regime on four points, which also served as the basis for relations between Rafsanjani and George Bush. They were: organization of the oil market, stabilization of the regime, the release of political prisoners, and the end to the Iran-Iraq war as an investment in the American elections 1988.-71

Just three months after Khomeini's death, the newly elected President Hashemi Rafsanjani moved swiftly to end Iran's political and economic isolation. He excluded from his Cabinet former Interior minister Ali Akbar Mohtashemi, the chief patron of anti-Western terrorist in Lebanon, and hardline

former Prime Minister Mir Hussein Mousavi. We'll have more surprises now, says; R.K. Ramazani, an Iran expert at the University of Virginia.⁷² A big surprise did come during the Gulf War, when Iran declared its neutrality in the war. When Iraq flew its cream of the Iraqi air force to Iran. Even American General Norman Schwarzkopf was surprised. No clear explanation came from Tehran. Rafsanjani did assure the US-led coalition, however, that the decision to provide sanctuary to some of Saddam's most sophisticated French and Soviet fighters and most of his SU-24 Gencer bombers would not affect Iran's neutral status. The planes, Iranian officials said, will be impounded and held until hostilities end. They also insisted that no deal had been cut with Baghdad in advance."⁷³

From the beginning of Rafsanjani's presidency Rafsanjani has worked quietly to improve ties with Washington... So far, Rafsanjani has succeeded on one major front: he has shed much of Iran's ultraconservative image and upgraded or restored ties with **many** European and Middle Eastern countries as well as Canada. ⁷⁴

Rafsanjani's aim is to make Iran into a "moderate" state. His policies seem to be working. As Newsweek reported, "In Teheran, peeling slogans have been scrubbed off the walls... A capitalist-style stock market is booming, children snap up Ninja Turtle toys and "Dancing with Wolves" is the first Hollywood movie to be screened legally in years."⁷⁵

What about all the anti-American slogans we hear all the time from the **various leaders** in Iran. Anti-American rhetoric by Islamic extremists in Tehran is not to be taken seriously. It is for domestic, anti-imperialist consumption that the **so-called radicals shout** war mongering slogans against the Americans,' **says an Iranian political scientist** living in Paris. 'Even the Iranian revolutionary Guards are in no mood to join the hostilities."⁷⁶ Rafsanjani is known as the pragmatist and a moderate, even if it means that he will abandon Allah's laws, he will do it. He is **known to have liberalized** social codes). He has not actually called for a reversal of strict **Islamic injunctions**, but in oblique ways he is signaling that he favors a more relaxed approach, **especially in the enforcement of Hijab**. In a much publicized sermon last November, **for example**, Rafsanjani chided fellow clerics who make a virtue of 'austerity' and argued that 'appreciating beauty and seeking entertainment are serious feelings. To fight them is not God's desire."⁷⁷ Rafsanjani also said, "that young people were being **asked to deny** the sexual urges for too long, and the temporary marriage, (a Shiite **institution endorsing** sexual liaisons for fixed periods of time) ought to be more widely accepted. "⁷⁸

Besides his liberal anti-Islamic views, it is clear that Rafsanjani has **been maintaining** trade relations with the United States, despite calling it the Great Satan. **Shortly after** the hostage affair, Washington loosened restrictions on trade with Tehran, and the US companies were allowed to sell Iran hardware. In March, 1991, **American Mitac** Corporation of Fremont CA., shipped \$28 million worth of computers to Raymeh Saz Engineering Co. in Iran. Another computer firm, Modular Computer Systems Inc. of Fort Lauderdale, FL., was given a license to ship \$1.3 **million worth of computer** to the Iranian Chemical Co. Siemens, the German **electronics firm, received US approval to sell Iran's** Rafsanjani industrial Complex \$241,000 **worth of computers in 1991**. It **also sold** Iran Telecom-communications Corp. \$276,000 worth of electronic equipment that year. Rockwell International sold Iranian helicopter gear and electronics worth \$533,000. Other contracts went to Apple Computer, **Sun Microsystems, Honeywell, NCR and AST Research**. Each sale was approved by the **Commerce Department after** consultation with other government agencies. ⁷⁹ Even after 1992 Iran-Iraq Arms Non-Proliferation Act, which forbids any transfer to Iran or Iraq of any **goods or technology** that could be used to make advanced weapons, the trade with **the US** has continued. The trade only dropped from \$747 million in **1992 to \$616 million in 1993**.⁸⁰

Conclusion

After reading through this paper, how can anyone claim that Iran is an Islamic State. Those who still insist, need to re-read the following Ayat of the Qur'an:

Take not Jews and Christian as your Auliyat....

Just mean seeking aid and protection from the Jews and **Christian would make us 'one of them'** (a non-Muslim). Surely Allah will curse the person who **actively is working to undermine** and mix-represent Islam, with the help of the Kuffar.

Again, Iran was chosen just as an example to show how the **Imperialist powers still manipulate** the Muslim Ummah. The situation in all of **the other 'Muslim' countries** is no different. May Allah protect the Muslims Ummah from the conspiracies of **the West and bring** back the true Islamic State, so that this **Ummah can rise up to its proper** place and establish justice for not just the Muslims, but also for the non-Muslims.

70 Bani Sadr, My Turn To Speak, page 219.

71 Bani Sadr, My Turn To Speak, page 212.

72 Business Week, September 11, 1989.

73 Time, Michael Serrill February 11, 1991.

74 Time, May 6, 1991.

75 Newsweek, April 27, 1992.

76 Time, February 11, 1991.

77 Time, May 6, 1991.

78 Time, May 6, 1991.

79 US News & World Report, November 14, 1994.

80 Ibid.

[Back to top](#)

Dialog Between A Muslim Scholar And Shia Students

Remember that the only sect that is saved on Judgment-Day is the one that strictly adheres to holy Quran and authentic Sunnah, You find today so-called "Islamic" sects which claim that they embody true Islam. However, those sects do or say something that is totally against Quran or Sunnah. "Ibathiah" which is the main sect in Oman, believe that the holy Quran is created rather than descended upon prophet Muhammad (ﷺ). This is totally contrary to the Quranic verse: "We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and We will assuredly guard it (from corruption)" (9:15). Shi'ites also believe that the Imam is impeccable, that is, he can never go wrong, and that he knows about the future. Can anyone know about the future other than Almighty Allah?! This belief of theirs contradicts the following verse: ""He (alone) knows the Unseen, nor does He make anyone acquainted with His Mysteries,"(26:72).

Scholar Salman Al-Odah (may Allah release him from the prison in which he has been unjustly thrown because he spoke out about religious contraventions in Saudi Arabia) met in the US Shi'ite students from Bahrain and the Eastern province of Saudi Arabia and the following dialogue took place:

Scholar: Tell me your opinion of the Khomeni of Iran?

Students: He was a great Islamic leader.

Scholar: Tell me your opinion of his revolution?

Students: His revolution prevailed over Kufr and scooped the Islamic Ummah from the mire into which it plunged.

Scholar: Do you think Khomeni put his trust in wrong places, that is, some of his followers who assisted him in his revolution were not worthy of his trust; they were deviant?

Students: Absolutely not! All his supporters were true Shi'ite Muslims who could never betray him; they were true to the Islamic cause.

Scholar: You said that Khomeni was a great leader and that he picked for his revolution the right people who could never betray him, because khomeni is an Imam and Imam can never go wrong. Is that what you said and meant?

Students: Exactly.

Scholar: Now tell me who is better Khomeni or prophet Muhammad (ﷺ)?

Students: Prophet Muhammad, naturally.

Scholar: Could the prophet go wrong?

Students: Certainly not.

Scholar: Could he put his trust in people unworthy of his trust?

Students: Never.

Scholar: So why do you disapprove of and slander those sahaba (prophet's disciples) who were closest to him, like Abu Baker Al-Sadeeq and Omar Ibn Al-Khattab and say that those most righteous people of the prophet usurped khilafah from Ali Ibn Abi Talib. How could the prophet (ﷺ) trust those people whom you think are unworthy of his trust. The prophet (ﷺ) should have known better about their disloyalty.

Students: They were loyal Muslims during the prophet's life but they went astray after his death.

Scholar: And do you think the matter of succeeding the prophet was so unimportant to Allah the Almighty that He did not tell the prophet (ﷺ) about it before he died?

The Shi'ite were struck-dumb!

There are many sects that consider itself Islamic while it is really not.

Any sect that has among its articles of belief something against Quran or Sunnah, no matter how small, is no longer Islamic.

Remember, brothers and sisters, that while you follow the Quran and Sunnah you may do something or believe in something that automatically casts you out of the fold of Islam. So beware! Stick to the letter to Quaran and Sunnah, no additions, no subtractions and no alterations. In this respect I remember a do'a (prayer) that the prophet used to say: " O You who can turn eyes and

hearts upside down do steady my heart on your religion".

Salaam

A Dialogue With Those Who Disagree With This Site

Why do you differentiate between Sunnis and Shias despite our need for unity?

And how can there be unity between Islam and the rejecters of Islam, or between the followers of Allah and the followers of Satan? Unity, my brother, is not accomplished at the cost of our religion and creed, but rather it should be built on the unity of creed. As the martyr Sayed Qutb said, "And then there was no choice but for the theoretical Islamic base, meaning creed, to manifest itself in a dynamic community since the first moment, with its targets, bringing people back to the Lordship of Allah alone... His Lordship, His governorship, His rule and His laws." And remember that when the People of Israel worshipped the bull, Moses came to them and pulled the beard of his brother Haroon, who apologized to him and said: **O son of my mother! Seize (me) not by my beard nor by (the hair of) my head! Truly I feared lest thou shouldst say, 'Thou has caused a division among the Children of Israel, and thou didst not observe my word!'"** (Taha 20:94).

Haroon had decided to leave the Israelis to what they were doing (worshiping the bull) and to wait for the opinion of Moses, because he feared causing the division of the Sons of Israel. So Moses reprimanded him with the harshest of reprimands because it is better for the people to be divided while monotheist than to stay united on polytheism. And we do not forget what is confirmed in Bukhari, that the angels described the Prophet ﷺ that he "divided between people".

And if the people of the Shi'a want unity then why do they [oppress Sunnis](#) in their countries? They allow the spilling of their blood, since the days of Qaramitah to our present days in [Iran](#). And know that we were not the ones who started attacking the Shi'a, but they started it. And if their curses and insults were directed to us only, then we would have forgiven them. But their animosity and their curses are directed toward the family of the Prophet ﷺ, his wives (the Mothers of the Believers), his sons of law, his companions, and whoever follows his Sunnah. The Shi'a admit that the first person to start cursing the companions (may Allah be pleased with them) was the Jewish Bin Saba, the founder of their sector. So it is not up to us to forgive them and the Prophet ﷺ says: **God has chosen me and chose for me companions. And he made them for me, so whoever insults them, upon him will be the curse of Allah, His Messenger, and all people. Allah will not accept from him any good deed or sacrifice."**

And I remind you of what came in Sahih Muslim about the incident of Ifk that the mother of the believers Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) said:

"So, on that day, Allah's Apostle got up on the pulpit and complained about 'Abdullah bin Ubai (bin Salul) before his companions, saying, 'O you Muslims! Who will relieve me from that man who has hurt me with his evil statement about my family? By Allah, I know nothing except good about my family and they have blamed a man about whom I know nothing except good and he used never to enter my home except with me.' Sad bin Mu'adh the brother of Banu 'Abd Al-Ashhal got up and said, 'O Allah's Apostle! I will relieve you from him; if he is from the tribe of Al-Aus, then I will chop his head off, and if he is from our brothers, i.e. Al-Khazraj, then order us, and we will fulfill your order.'

This hadith indicates the inclusion of the mothers of the believers with the house of the Prophet and his family. It also indicates the mandate of the killing of the ones cursing the mothers of the believers. Further, it shows that the one who defends the ones who curse the mothers of the believers is a hypocrite. And whoever labels with adultery the pure, the good, the mother of the believers, the wife of the Messenger of the Lord of all Worlds, <![endif]>, in this world and the

latter day, as it was confirmed by him, then he is from the type of Abdullah bin Abi Salool, the head of the hypocrites, and the condition of the Messenger of Allah, ﷺ, says: Oh Muslims, who defends me from those who hurt me in my family! And Allah says:

"Those who annoy Allah and His Messenger - Allah has cursed them in this world and in the Hereafter, and has prepared for them a humiliating punishment. And those who annoy believing men and women undeservedly, bear (on themselves) a calumny and a glaring sin." (Al-Ahzab 33:57-58) So you want to say: "No, we do not defend you, oh Messenger of Allah, against these!" so we become hypocrites defending hypocrites?

Why do you call them the Rafidah (Rejecters)?

We were not the ones who called them that, but they were the ones who invented this name for their group. The story of this name is that they came to Zayed bin Ali bin Alhusain and said: "Denounce Abu Baker so we would follow you." He said: "They are the companions of my grandfather. Instead, I will pledge the allegiance to them." They said: "Then we reject you." So they called themselves Rafidah and the ones who agreed with him and pledge the allegiance to him Zaydiyah. (look in the introduction of Ibn Khaldoun). And their Shaikh Almjlessy in his book "The Seas" (where he mentioned 4 of their hadeeths) also mentioned this name.

Alklyanee stated in his book "Alrawd min Al-Kafi" (a long testament from Mohammad bin Selman from his father) that Aba Basseer said to Abu Abdul Allah "...may Allah make me a sacrifice for you, that we have been given a nickname that broke our backs and killed our hearts and made our blood legal to be spilled by governors in a Hadith that was told to them by their scholars."

Abu Abdullah said: **AlRafidah?**

He said: "yes." Abu Abdullah responded: By the name of Allah, they did not call you that, **but Allah called you that...** Volume 8 (The praises of Shia and their classes) Page 28.

But then when it was clear to them that this name is the name of an astray group that the Messenger <im>ﷺ prophesied the coming of, and ordered the killing of its followers, some of them tried to deny that name. And we call them that for their rejection of Islam, because it was told that Ali bin Abi Taleb said: the Messenger ﷺ said, **"Near the end of time, a group will come from my nation that is called Rafidah, they reject Islam."** Documented in Ibn Hanbal's book. The Hadith that Alklyanee pointed out was what Ali said that the Prophet ﷺ said: **"Should I tell you about a work that if you do, you will be one of the people of paradise? -and you are of the people of paradise- there will be after us people who are called Rafidah, if you reach them (their time) then kill them for they are polytheists."** then Ali said: "There will be after us people who will show our love, lie on our behalf, the evidence of that is that they curse Abu Baker and Omar (may Allah be pleased with them)."

The Shia declare both Shahadas, they pray, make Azan and make the pilgrimage, so how can we label them as Kafers?

And the Murtadeen (apostates- those who spilt from Islam after the death of the Prophet) whom Abu Baker fought and spilled their blood were witnessing that there is no God but Allah and Mohammad is the Messenger of Allah. They prayed, fasted, and made the pilgrimage ... but all of that did not benefit them while they refused to pay Zakah to the successors of the Prophet ﷺ (and Shi'a deny Zakah and they pay the fifth of their earnings to their Imams only). And some of these Murtadeen equaled the Messenger ﷺ and Mosaylamah Alkazab (a false Prophet) so their blood became allowed to be spilled and they were out of the religion of Islam, so how about those who raise their Imams to the level of God, and claim that the Imams know all the knowledge that came out to the Angels, Prophets and Messengers, and that the Imams know what was written and being written (the Unseen), and that the Imams have the knowledge of when they will die and they die by their choice only. And this goes against the Ayah: **"Verily the knowledge of the Hour is with**

Allah (alone). It is He Who sends down rain, and He Who knows what is in the wombs. Nor does anyone know what it is that he will earn on the morrow: nor does any one know in what land he is to die. Verily with Allah is full knowledge and He is acquainted (with all things)." {Luqman 31:34}. But these are from the same type of Shi'a whom Ali bin Abi Taleb has burned as was confirmed in Saheeh Bukhari.

It was reported in the two Saheeh books that the Prophet said about the Khwarej (outsiders), **"Wherever you see them kill them. If I reach their time, I will kill them like the people of 'Aad"** that with the fact that they were some of the people worshipping the most, to the point where some of the companions looked down on their own prayers on comparison to the prayers of the Khwarej. And they got their knowledge from the companions. But they were not benefited by testifying to "no God but Allah", or by their bountiful acts of worship, or by their embracing Islam, due to their labeling the companions as Kafers.

And I would like to use as a witness one of the scholars of the Shia Shi'a, Ne'mat Allah AlJazaeri in his book "Alanwar Alniemanyah", where he wrote, "We did not get together with them -the Sunnah- on Allah or the Prophet or the Imams, because they say: that their Lord sent Mohammad as a Prophet and his successors is Abu Baker, and us, the Shi'a, do not believe in this Lord Who made the successors of his Prophet Abu Baker, that Lord is not our Lord and that Prophet is not our Prophet"

Isn't it more imperative for us to fight Jews instead of fighting those who testify to 'there is no God but Allah'?

And how do we seek help from the hypocrites when Allah said about them: **"O ye who believe! Take not into your intimacy those outside your ranks: They will not fail to corrupt you. They only desire for you to suffer: Rank hatred has already appeared from their mouths: What their hearts conceal is far worse. We have made plain to you the Signs, if ye have wisdom."** {Aal-Imran 3:118}

And He also said: **"If they had come out with you, they would not have added to your (strength) but only (made for) disorder, hurrying to and fro in your midst and sowing sedition among you, and there would have been some among you who would have listened to them. But Allah knoweth well those who do wrong. "** {9:47}.

Plus, have you forgotten that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ fought the Jews even though they witness that there is no God but Allah? Or have you forgotten that the founder of this sector is Bin Saba'a the Jew; and that these Shi'a were always allied to Jews, Crusaders and all the enemies of this nation throughout history? Therefore, is saying, "no God but Allah" enough?

And I would like to go back once more to the word of Abu Baker against the Murtadeen (whom the Shi'a are satisfied with). Mathna bin Hareth Alshaybany chases them until they entered Mada'aen, which is a Persian province. Abu Baker corresponded with him and asked him for clarifications regarding his chase and entrance to Persia, so Mathna answered saying: "I fear to be stabbed in the back, if I am safe in my rear I would fight them even if they seek refuge in Kesra's palace."

I end my discussion with what Mathna said in his answer to Abu Baker, may Allah be satisfied with him, in which he mentioned fearing an attack from behind! So do I feel that the Muslims today are safe from these back stabbers? Nations are attacking the Muslims from every direction like hungry people coming to a plate of food. Whatever Muthana feared we should fear a thousand folds today, in each outpost and front, especially because today our chests are exposed to our enemies and our backs are open to every backstabber and traitor. But even more so, there are amongst us people who call on help from other monotheists - who add nothing but weakness to us - and who call on us to leave our backs open to every sinner and deviated pervert.

Yes, Salah Aldeen Alayoby fought the Shi'a before fighting the Christians, even more so, he annihilate the Abiedy State (Fatimad) before fighting the Crusaders. And if it were not for that, it would have been impossible for him to liberate Jerusalem. And with help from Allah and then help

from Salah Aldeen Alayoby, there is not a single Shi'a in North Africa now, although it was under the influence of their misguidance for many years. Due to the existence of the Fatimid State, the Crusader state existing in Palestine, the Shi'a state in Iran today and due to the fragmentations of Muslims, the Jewish state exists in Palestine. Because this fragmentation and this breakup is painful for us, then the existence of the Jews and the Shi'a as states in the heart of the Muslim world is equally painful. Ignorant voices are raised then voices that are oblivious to our history call for unity with the Shi'a. This is a grand disaster that extends life to the tragedy of the Muslim world and is an obstacle in the way of their unity and their rise as a good nation. This is a nation that should rise to give to humanity, refuse the aid of the devils, worships one Lord and does not worship anything with Him.

This is a testimony from history that shows that the Shi'a are a cause in the failure of the Muslims in continuing their conquests. Even historians mentioned that the Khalifa in Istanbul had to withdraw their conquering armies from the gateways of Vienna (capital of Austria) due to an attack from the Shi'a of Iran. So how much good was ruined at the hands of Imams sitting on thrones, fooling us with the good word, "No God but Allah and Mohammad is the Messenger of Allah" then stabbing us in the back? It is mandatory to fight the Extremist Shi'a before fighting the Jews and the Christians because the danger of the Jews is known because they are Jews and the same with the crusaders. But the Shi'a pray toward our Kaba, eat from what we slaughter, pray our prayers and then they stab us in the back after they fool the fools amongst us.

But some Shaikh said that Shia are not Kafers?

Is it a matter of opinions and trends? We have explained to you [Allah's ruling in Shia \(from Quran and Sunnah\)](#) and we attached to that what was said by the early Muslims, and the latter generations and their consensus, that the Shi'a are Kafers. And among these we mentioned: the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, Omar bin Al-khattab, Ali bin Abi Talib, Imam Abu Hanifah, Imam Shafi'i, Imam Malik, Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal, Bukhari, Ibn Hazm, Alandalssy, Alghazali, Judge Eyad, Sheik Alislam Ibn Taymeh, Ibn Katheer, the scholar Ibn Khaldoon, Ahmad bin Youness, Judge Shareek, bin Mubarak, Bin Aljawzyeh and many more. Even more, Ibn Hanefah and Ibn Taymeyah ruled that whoever denies that the Shi'a are Kafer is a Kafer himself. And amongst the modern ones: All of the scholars of the Arab peninsula, Abu Ala'ala Almaudodi (Pakistan/Bangladesh), Bahjah Al Bettar (Syria), Alhelaly (Morocco), Albany (Syria/Jordan), Mustafa Asebai (the founder of The Muslim Brotherhood in Syria), Albasheer Alibrahimi (Algeria), Muhib Aldeen Alkhateeb (India), Alghazali and Mohammad Rasheed Reda (both are from Egypt and they were some of the strongest advocate for closeness, then they turned against Shia) and many more. But you want us to not believe them and follow some Shaikh instead? May Allah distance us from this.

Be aware my brother or sister that whoever obeys the scholars and their rules, in forbidding what Allah made permissible and allowing what Allah has forbidden, then they are worshipping Lords beside Allah just like the Jews and Christians did before. And I begin to wonder at the reply of some people when I pose to them this point:

"Allah said this, his Messenger said this, and this is what the companions- the masters of all generation- also said." they tell me:

"But my Shaikh told me that on his Shaikh said otherwise, and the Shaikh for me is the most important source."

So if this is the deal, is it allowed for us to keep it a secret in order to avoid trouble?

May Allah distance us from such ideas! How can we do that and Allah the Lord of all said in Surat Albaqarah: {2:174-176}, **"Those who conceal Allah's revelations in the Book, and purchase for them a miserable profit, they swallow into themselves naught but Fire; Allah will not address them on the Day of Resurrection, nor purify them: Grievous will be their penalty. They are the ones who buy Error in place of Guidance and Torment in place of Forgiveness. Ah! what boldness (they show) for the Fire! (Their doom is) because Allah sent down the Book in truth but those who seek causes of dispute in the Book are in a**

schism Far (from the purpose)." And He said in Ayah 159, "Those who conceal the clear (Signs) We have sent down, and the Guidance, after We have made it clear for the People in the Book, on them shall be Allah's curse, and the curse of those entitled to curse," and He also said in Surah Aal-Imran, "And remember Allah took a Covenant from the People of the Book, to make it known and clear to mankind, and not to hide it; but they threw it away behind their backs, and purchased with it some miserable gain! And vile was the bargain they made!" {4:187}

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said, "If innovations start to appear and my companions are insulted, let the scholars present their knowledge [to people]. And whoever does not do that upon him will be the curse of Allah, His Messenger, and all people. Allah will not accept from him any good deed or sacrifice".

And he also said, "When the latter generations of this Ummah curse its first generations, if someone conceals a Hadith, he has concealed what Allah has revealed." (Ibn Majah). And warning from what they are doing is not enough. It is a prohibition for any Muslim to take them as allies or friends, or a curse will come on the nation like the curse that came upon the Jews. "Curses were pronounced on those among the Children of Israel who rejected Faith, by the tongue of David and of Jesus the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excesses. Nor did they forbid one another the iniquities which they committed: evil indeed were the deeds which they did. Thou seest many of them turning in friendship to the Unbelievers. Evil indeed are (the works) which their souls have sent forward before them (with the result), that Allah's wrath is on them, and in torment will they abide." {5: 78-80}

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: "If one of the people of Israel saw his brother sinning, he would advise him so he won't be punished by Allah (for not forbidding the evil). And then the next day, his brother's sin would not prevent him from eating and mixing with him and even being his partner. When Allah saw that from them, he hit their hearts with each other and cursed them on the tongue of David and Jesus the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excesses."

After all of this, how can anyone want to hide and keep secret what Allah has given us from knowledge? By Allah we will never do that.

Isn't it time to forget the past and to end this struggle that has lasted 1400 years? Is there a chance for closeness?

Well, is there an end to the struggle between good and evil, or between the supporters of Allah and supporter of the devil? And have the Shi'a regretted their criminal history against Islam or have they stopped their animosity toward Islam? If their curses were directed at [us](#) we would forgive them, but these curses are directed toward the [Messenger's family, his wives, sons of law and his companions](#), so how do we forgive that? This struggle will continue, as our beloved Prophet told us, until the coming out of the Dajal. Then the Muslims will kill him and they will kill his followers from the Jews, the polytheists and the Shi'a.

How can closeness be possible with those who believe in changing the book of Allah and allege that their Imams receive Godly books after the Quran, or with those who see that the Imams are higher than the Prophethood? How can we be close to those who say the Imams are like Prophets, explain worshiping Allah alone (which is obeying the Messengers) in a way different from the original context, allege that it means obedience to the Imams, define polytheism as obeying others with the Imams, call the companions Kafers, curse the Messenger's wives (who are the mothers of the believers), and rules that the companions all left Islam after the death of the Prophet except 3 or 4 or 7 depending their different opinions? Also, they deviate from the creed of the Islam due to their belief in the Imams, their infallibility, Tiqyah, and they believe in the come back, the disappearance, and the beginning? I advise my brothers and sisters to read the speech of [Shaikh Alhuthaifi](#) (given in

front of the Massjed of the Prophet) about closeness between Sunnah and Shia.

The most important thing to know: In the past the extremists of the Tafidah were the minority, but today they are all extremists without any exception. This was acknowledged by one of their biggest swindlers... oh, I am sorry, I should say... by one of their biggest scholars in the field of evaluations of men (Ayatullah al-mamqani). In every biography about one of these extremists, he claimed that what was considered extremism during the old generations has now become a necessity for today's sector. And it is known that the scholars of Sunnah have called the old extremists of the Shia kafers and that is how we know about the latter generations.

What do we tell those who seek closeness?

The issue of closeness between Shia and Sunnis is one of the issues that are presented always by some writers who label themselves as enlightened. But who-so-ever has his vision enlightened by Allah would not doubt that the past and current creed of the Shia is against the creed of Sunnis, the majority of Muslims and the early Muslims.

We wonder when someone makes light of this matter and describes us as strict and extremists. To anyone desiring closeness between Sunnis and Shias we say: We will agree with you and we will respond to you on one condition, that we use an arbiter, the book of Allah and the correct and confirmed Sunnah of his Prophet, because Allah ordered us to do so when we disagree, **"... (And) if you differ in anything amongst yourselves, refer it to Allah and His Messenger..."** [4:59]

We also say to those who want closeness: How can we be close while they question the Quran? And never mind their denial because it is confirmed in their books. They even claim that a surah called "Surah Alwaleya" is part of the Quran. This exposes them and shows their lies. So by Allah, who do we believe? Do we believe the Great One who guaranteed the up keep of his book, **"We have, without doubt, sent down the Message; and We will assuredly guard it (from corruption)."** {15:9} or do we believe them and throw the book of Allah behind our backs?

We say also to those who want closeness: How do we get close to those who curse the best we have ever had and the best of all people after Prophets and messengers? How do we get close to those who curse Abi Baker and Omar and Uthman? It is even confirmed in the books of the Shi'a that they judged all Sahaba to be Murtadeen and Kafers, and they make exception only for few like Abi Zar, Bilal, Almiqdad and Salman may Allah be satisfied with them. By cursing the sahaba, they curse those who passed down the message of Islam after the Prophet. If they curse them and call them kafers, then who carried this jurisprudence (Quran and Sunnah) aside of them? And as some of those before us said: they want to defame our witness. So, if we believe this in relation to the companions of the Prophet, may Allah distance us from that, then how do we trust what they carried to us and how do we believe in what they said? Oh nation of Mohammed, where are your minds?

We also say to those who want closeness: How do we get close to those who accuse our mother, Aysha may Allah be satisfied with her, of committing adultery while she is pure and innocent from committing that? Allah pronounced her innocent from above the seven heavens by sending down verses that will be read until the day of resurrection! So they insist on disbelieving the Quran, and whoever disbelieves in the Quran is a Kafer.

If the Shia believe in changing the Holy Qur'an then they will not believe you at all. Don't you hear the words of Allah swt, **"Do you then hope that they would believe in you, and a party from among them indeed used to hear the Word of Allah, then altered it after they had understood it, and they know (this)."** {2:75} So why waste time arguing with them?

Brothers and sisters, you might have forgotten what Allah swt said regarding the Jews, **"They say, 'Our hearts are the wrappings (which preserve Allah's Word: we need no more).'** Nay, **Allah's curse is on them for their blasphemy: Little is it they believe."** {3:88}. Notice His saying "little is it they believe," meaning that a very small minority of them enter Islam. And we have learned that from these Jews came the mother of the believers Safya, may Allah be satisfied with her, and the great companion Abdul Allah bin Salaam, may Allah be satisfied with him, and many more who are esteemed in Islam. If the Jews were like that then how about the Shi'a?

Why do you preach to people whom Allah will destroy or torture severely?

"To discharge your duty to your Lord, and perchance they may fear Him." Have you forgotten, dear brothers and sisters, the story of the people of Saturday? They were 3 groups: A group that overstepped its boundaries on Saturday and these are the sinners, a group who did not do the sin but they did not criticize it and they did not boycott those who committed it, and a group that advised them to stay away from sin, encourage them to do good, boycotted them, and went even further by building a wall between them so they would not intermix with them. So when Allah's punishment came, Allah mutated the first two groups into monkeys and pigs and saved the ones who preached against sin as Allah swt said, **"When they disregarded the warnings that had been given them, We rescued those who forbade Evil; but We visited the wrong-doers with a grievous punishment because they were given to transgression."** {7:165}

Also, we have mentioned the story of how two of their greatest scholars reverted, Ayatu Allah abu Alfadel Albarka'e and Kasrawi, and the story of the reversion of one of their youth. There is also their great scholar Dr. Mousa Almusawi, and there is an Iranian Rafidi who has reverted on my hands personally. Allah swt revealed that Pharaoh will never believe in the message of Mousa, but He still ordered Mousa to deliver the message to Pharaoh so that it may be used as evidence against him. Thus, delivering the message is mandatory upon all of us and if none of us do it then all of us are sinners. So thank Allah my brothers and sisters that there are some who take care of this mandate by preaching to these people and by advising them against such sins.

At the end, there is only one question left: who are you?

We are of the victorious group that sticks to the teachings of our beloved Prophet Mohammad, the most complete prayers and greetings be upon him. We belong to the saved group, insha Allah, that the Messenger ﷺ mentioned when he said:

"The Jews were split up into seventy-one or seventy-two sects; and the Christians were split up into seventy one or seventy-two sects; and my community will be split up into seventy-three sects. All of them are in the Hell-fire except one." They said, "And who are they, O' Messenger of Allah?" He said, "What I and my companions follow."

And insha Allah we are the followers of the righteous, whom Allah swt said about them, **"And those who came after them say: ,Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who came before us into the Faith, and leave not, in our hearts, rancor (or sense of injury) against those who have believed. Our Lord! Thou art indeed Full of Kindness, Most Merciful."** (59:10)

And insha Allah we are of those who follow the middle path, who do not hate the companions of the Prophet as the Shia and Khawarij do, and of those who do not worship their grave sites instead of worshiping Allah (as some Sufis do). Insha Allah we are on the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and on the guidance of the early generation. We are from the people of Sunnah and Jama'a.

Abu Baker & Zakat-Evaders

Are We Allowed To Ignore Our Differences?

Some people might argue that we should forget all the differences no matter how significant they are and concentrate on the outside enemies of Islam. However, by looking at the life of the Sahaba, we find that we should work on both. Let us take a look at this story, just for example:

As the news of the Prophet's death spread, a number of tribes rebelled and refused to pay Zakat (poor-due), saying that this was due only to the Prophet . At the same time a number of impostors claimed that the prophethood had passed to them after Muhammad and they raised the standard of revolt. To add to all this, two powerful empires, the Eastern Roman and the Persian, also threatened the new-born Islamic state at Medina.

Under these circumstances, many Companions of the Prophet, including Umar, advised Abu Bakr to make concessions to the Zakat evaders, at least for a time. They told him to accept their prayer from them and leave it up to Allah to judge them for denying Zakat. The new Caliph disagreed. He insisted that the Divine Law cannot be divided, that there is no distinction between the obligations of Zakat and Salat (prayer), and that any compromise with the injunctions of God would eventually erode the foundations of Islam. Umar and others were quick to realize their error of judgment. The revolting tribes attacked Medina but the Muslims were prepared. Abu Bakr himself led the charge, forcing them to retreat. He then made a relentless war on the false claimants to prophethood, most of whom submitted and again professed Islam.

The threat from the Roman Empire had actually arisen earlier, during the Prophet's lifetime. The Prophet had organized an army under the command of Usama, the son of a freed slave. The army had not gone far when the Prophet had fallen ill so they stopped. After the death of the Prophet , the question was raised whether the army should be sent again or should remain for the defense of Medina. Again Abu Bakr showed a firm determination. He said, "I shall send Usama's army on its way as ordered by the Prophet, even if I am left alone."

To make the long story short, we can see from this example that we should work on both sides at the same time. Abu Baker (may Allah be pleased with him) did not agree to make a treaty with the Arabic tribes nor delay sending the army to attack the Roman Empire. He had a **STRONG BELIEF** in Allah and this is what we **LACK** nowadays. So let's remember: our unity should be based on the Qur'an and Sunnah. **There can be NO victory if we try to achieve it AT THE EXPENSE of the Qur'an and Sunnah.**

May Allah guide Muslims and unite them. May He grant us victory over all enemies of Islam.

A Poignant Message To The Muslim Ummah

**The Historic Khutbah Of Shaykh Ali Abd-Ur-Rahmaan Al-Hudhaifee, Imaam Of Masjid-An-Nabawi (In Saudi Arabia) Just Before He Was Placed Under "House Arrest".
Delivered In Masjid Nabawi, 15th Dhu-L-Qadah, 1418 Hijri/ 13th March 1998**

All praise is for Allah, the Sustainer of the entire universe, Lord of all worlds. He enlightened the hearts of His Aulia with divine guidance and strength of belief, and provided strength to their perception with the luminance of Wahi.

Whomsoever He desired He guided to the right path, whoever He wanted, in His wisdom, He led astray. Thus did the hearts of the Kuffar and Munafiqeen become blind to accepting the light of Truth, and Allah Ta'ala's entire argument was established over all His creatures.

I offer praise to my Rabb, and such gratitude which is worthy of His Being and magnificent sovereignty. I bear witness that there is no god except Allah, He is One and Only and has no partner; that He is Master of the Day of Qiyamah. And I bear witness that our Prophet and leader Muhammad ﷺ is His bondsman and Messenger, leader of all the ancients and the moderns. He was sent forth with the Holy Qur'an as a blessing for the Muslim, a bearer of glad tidings to them.

O Allah! Send Durood and Salaam, shower blessings upon your Bondsman and Messenger, Muhammad (ﷺ), upon his descendants, Ashaab and Tabi'een.

Amma-Ba`ad:

O Muslims, fear Allah. Fear Allah as is His due. Hold fast to the strong bond of Islam. O people of Allah! Without doubt Allah Ta'ala's greatest blessing upon man is his true faith. Through it Allah Ta'ala brings to life the dead hearts of the Kuffar, bestows the light of Imaan to the blind led astray. Allah Ta'ala says:

"Is he who was dead (without Faith by ignorance and disbelief) and We gave him life (by knowledge and Faith) and set for him a light (of Belief) whereby he can walk amongst men, like him who is in the darkness (of disbelief, polytheism and hypocrisy) from which he can never come out?"

(The Noble Qur'an 6:122).

And He further says:

" Shall he then who knows that what has been revealed unto you (O Muhammad - salallaahu `alayhee wasallam) from your Lord is the Truth be like him who is blind? But it is only the men of understanding that pay heed."

(The Noble Qur'an 13:19)

Allah Ta'ala's Deen in the Heavens and the Earth, for the ancients and the moderns is only the Deen-ul-Islam. The orders of Sharee'ah were different for every prophet. Every prophet was given those orders which were appropriate for their particular Ummah. In His divine knowledge and wisdom, whichever order He thought proper, He cancelled, which ever one He wanted He retained.

But when He sent down the Prince among men, ﷺ He made null and void **all** previous Sharee`ahs, and bound all men and Jinn (**creation of Allah's made from smokeless fire**) to render obedience to him.

Allah Ta'ala says:

"Say (O Muhammad - ﷺ): "O mankind! Verily, I am sent to you all as the Messenger of Allah - to Whom belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth. Laa ilaha illa Huwa (none has the right to be worshipped but He); It is He Who gives life and causes death. So believe in Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad - ﷺ) the Prophet who can neither read nor write (i.e Muhammad - ﷺ), who believes in Allah and His words [(this Qur'an), the Torah and the Injeel and also Allah's word: "Be!" - and he was i.e. Jesus - son of Maryam `alayhee wasallam], and follow him that so you may be guided."
(The Noble Qur'an 7:158)

And it is a saying of the Holy Prophet ﷺ:

"By Him in whose hands is the soul of Muhammad, every Jew or Christian of this age who hears my call and yet dies without believing me, shall be one of the people of Jahannam."

Thus anyone who does not believe in Rasoolullah ﷺ, will burn in Jahannam forever. Allah Ta'ala does not accept any other Deen than Islam.

"And whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it will never be accepted of him, and in the Hereafter he will be one of the losers."
(The Noble Qur'an 3:85).

As Allah Ta'ala sent His Prophet ﷺ with such a Sharee`at which is the choicest, the **most** excellent, with a Deen which is complete in **every** respect, He has included in it all the basic principles which had been sent down upon all the earlier prophets. Thus He says:

"He (Allah) has ordained for you the same religion (Islam) which He ordained for Noah, and that which We have inspired you (O Muhammad - ﷺ), and that which we ordained for Abraham, Moses, and Jesus saying you should establish religion (i.e. to do what it orders you to do practically), and make no divisions in it (religion) (i.e. various sects in religion). Intolerable for the Mushrikun (Disbelievers), is that to which you (O Muhammad - salallaahu 'alayhee wasallam) call them. Allah chooses for Himself whom He wills, and guides unto Himself who turns to Him in repentance and in obedience."
(The Noble Qur'an 42:13)

The followers of the Jews and the Christians know for sure that the Deen of Muhammad ﷺ is the true Deen, but jealousy with the Muslims, arrogance, love of wealth, selfish desires are a barrier between them and Islam. Moreover even before the descent of Hudhoor ﷺ the Christians and Jews had altered their heavenly books, and completely changed their religion. Thus they remain, firm upon their **Kufr**, led astray from the right path.

After a brief introduction of Haq and Batil, for us Muslims, this movement which has been started to bring closer together different religions, is a very painful thing. It hurts us Muslims to hear the call

being made of a reconciliation between these religions, and from another direction a call for reconciliation between the Ahlus-Sunnah and the shee'ah (**Shia**). It is not to our liking too the invitation being extended by those 'intellectuals' who are not even acquainted with the basic and essential doctrines of Islam.

Especially now when wars are being fought on the basis of religion and all advantages are connected with it, such movements and invitations are even more dangerous for Islam and the Muslims.

Without doubt Islam invites the Jews and Christians to save themselves from Jahannam (Hell) and enter Jannah (Paradise); renounce Batil and accept Islam.

Allah Ta'ala says:

"Say (O Muhammad - ﷺ): 'O People of the Scripture (Jews and Christians): Come to a word that is just between us and you, that we worship none but Allah, and that we associate no partners with Him, and that none of us shall take others as lords besides Allah.' Then, if they turn away, say: 'Bear witness that we are Muslims'".
(The Noble Qur'an 3:64).

Islam gives permission to the Christians and Jews to continue upon their religion but only if they remain **subordinated** to Islam; pay Jizyah to the Muslims and keep the peace. Islam does not force the Christians and Jews to become Muslims, as in the Holy Qur'an it is said:

"There is no compulsion in religion. Verily, the Right Path has become distinct from the wrong path."
(The Noble Qur'an 2:256).

Islam is **pure** toleration and a well-wisher of **all** humanity. It does state that the Deen of the Jews and Christians is Batil so that whoever wishes to embrace Islam can do so, and whoever so desires can remain a **Kafir**. If the Jews, Christians and **Mushrikeen** are willing to accept Islam, then it will embrace them.

They will as brothers to the Muslims, for Islam does not admit of any prejudice on the basis of race or colour. History itself is a witness to this fact and furthermore Allah **Ta'ala** announces:

" O mankind! We have created you from a male and a female, and made you into nations and tribes, that you may know one another. Verily, the most honourable of you in the sight of Allah is that (believer) who has At Taqwa [i.e. one of the Muttaqun: i.e. pious and righteous persons who fear Allah much (abstain from all kinds of sins and evil deeds which He has forbidden)]..."
(The Noble Qur'an 49:13)

As to the question of a joining between Islam, Christianity and Judaism that is simply **impossible**. Allah **Ta'ala** Himself says:

"Not alike are the blind (disbelievers in Islamic Monotheism) and the seeing (believers in Islamic Monotheism). Nor are (alike) the darkness (disbelief) and the Light (Belief in Islamic Monotheism). Nor are (alike) the shade and the sun's heat. Nor are (alike) the living (believers) and the dead (disbelievers). Verily, Allah makes whom He will hear, but you cannot make hear those who are in graves."

(The Noble Qur'an 35:19-22).

In the same way is this notion wrong that the Muslims should relinquish some of the Islamic tenets, ignore or show apathy towards them, in order to incline the Jews and Christians towards them; or that the Muslims should befriend them in order to bring them closer to Islam. A true Muslim can never do so.

Allah Ta'ala says:

"You (O Muhammad - ﷺ) will not find any people who believe in Allah and the Last Day, making friendship with those who oppose Allah and His Messenger (Muhammad - salallaahu `alayhee wasallam), even though they were their fathers, or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred (people)."

(The Noble Qur'an 58:22)

In short, there is **no** connection, **no** relationship between the Muslims and the **Kuffar**. In spite of this, Islam does not allow any Muslim to be cruel to the **Kuffaar**. Islam has bound the Muslims to be just and fair to them too. On the other hand a Muslim has been ordered to defend his faith, to hear enmity towards Batil, and not only that, but make efforts the break its strength. This distinction between Islam and **Kufr** can only be achieved by holding fast to the fundamentals and beliefs of Islam.

By persevering upon faith and strictly adhering to the orders of Islam, can the Muslims prosper in the world and thereby by protect, safeguard their honour and their rights. Right or **Haq** can be established, Batil can be identified as Batil only through perseverance upon Deen. The campaign which has been started to unite different religions, is not only against the spirit of Islam but **will land the Muslims into terrible trouble and misfortune**. The disastrous results of such a movement will be disastrous; weakening of **Imaan**, interpolation of beliefs, **friendship with the enemies of Allah Ta'ala**.

Allah Ta'ala has ordered those of the Islamic faith to be friends of one another **only**. He says,

"The Believers, men and women, are 'Auliya' (helpers, supporters, friends, protectors) of one another..."

(The Noble Qur'an 9:71)

While, the **Kuffaar**, they may belong to any group have been designated as friends of each other by Him:

"And those who disbelieve are allies to one another, (and) if you (Muslims of the whole world collectively) do not do so (i.e. become allies, as one united block with one Khalifa - chief Muslim ruler for the whole Muslim world to make victorious Allah's religion of Islamic Monotheism), there will be Fitnah (wars, battles, polytheism, etc.) and oppression on earth, and a great mischief and corruption."

(The Noble Qur'an 8:73)

The famous Mufassir Imaam Ibn Kathir (**Raheemahullahu Ta'ala**) has interpreted it in this way: If you do not adopt separation from the Kuffaar, and befriend the Muslims, a great mischief will be caused among the people. '**Mischief**', here means the intermingling of the Muslims with the Kuffaar, and of the truth becoming doubtful. Thus a mixing of the Muslims and Kuffar will lead to a mischief of **great** magnitude.

Allah Ta'ala says:

"O you who believe! Take not the Jews and the Christians as 'Auliya' (friends, protectors, helpers, etc.), they are but 'Auliya' to one another."

(The Noble Qur'an 5:51)

How can there be any similarity, any bond between Islam and **Yahudiyyat**, (the Jewish faith) when Islam is exceptional, with its purity, light, brilliance, nobility, justice, toleration, magnanimity, high morality, equally for man or Jinn, and **Yahudiyyat** is, a collection of materialism and narrow-mindedness, which bears malice towards humanity, is steeped in moral degradation, greed and covetousness.

So how can there be any link between Islam and **Yahudiyyat**?... Can any Muslim tolerate the aspersion cast upon the pious, pure character of Maryam ('alayhee sallam) by the Jews?... Can the Muslims bear the presence of the Jews who call 'Eesa ('alayhee sallam) (Jesus) the son of a whore?... 'aoodhubillah. Allah forbid!

And on this account how can there be **any** link between the Holy Qur'an and the Talmud, the holy book of the **Satanic** Jews?

Similarly, there is **no** similarity between Christianity and Islam. Islam is a pure and clean religion believing in the oneness of Allah, in **Tawheed**. It is **pure** justice and a blessing. It is complete Sharee'ah; the Revealed Law.

Whereas Christianity is a deviation from the right path. The misled Christians hold the belief of **Trinity** - the Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost. Christianity **claims** that Christ is God, **and** the son of God.

Can any sane and sensible person really believe that God could be nurtured in a mother's womb, can reason admit to a God who eats and drinks, rides upon a donkey, sleeps and defecates ? So how can there be any possible association or compromise between such a ridiculous religion and Islam ?

Moreover, Islam acknowledges the greatness of 'Eesa 'alayhissalaam (Jesus Christ). It is a religious tenet of the Islaamic faith that 'Eesa alayhissalaam is a bondsman of Allaah ta'aalaa, a Holy Prophet of the Banee Israel (Children of Israel), and one of the foremost messengers of Allaah ta'aalaa.

How can there be any compromise or link between the Ahl-us-Sunnah and the Shee'ah ? The Ahl-us-Sunnah are those who uphold the Qur'aan and the Hadeeth (Sunnah). It is through them that Allaah tabarak wa ta'aalaa has protected the deen. They are those who engaged in Jihaad for the glory and dignity of Islam and established the glorious history of Islam.

On the other hand the state of **the Rawaafidh (Shee'ah) is that they are those who curse and insult the Sahabah** (Radiallaahu anhum). They are those who are denigrating and demolishing Islam. For, indeed, it is the Sahaabah (Radiallaahu anhum) who are the ones through whom the Deen has been passed down to us. So those people who curse and insult them, in reality, are destroying Islam.

Therefore, how can there be any association or compromise between the Ahl-us-Sunnah and the Rawaafidh (Shee'ah) whilst they (Shee'ahs) curse and denigrate the three Khulafaa: Abu Bakr Siddeeq, Umar Faarooq and Uthman, Radiallaahu anhum ?

If they had any sense, they would know and appreciate that they are in reality cursing the Holy

Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam himself. Abu Bakr and Umar radiallaahu anhumaa were both fathers-in-law of the Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam. Also, during the lifetime of the Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam both were his right hand men; and after his demise, it is they who had great worry feeling for the welfare of the Deen. Who else has ever been honoured with such a position and honour as was granted to these two ? Again, it is these two who had always participated and had been with the Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam during all the Ghazaawaat (battles). These facts are enough to refute the Shee'ah beliefs.

As for Uthmaan radiallaahu anhu, he was the husband to two daughters of the Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam. It is clear that Allaah tabarak wa ta'aalaa does not choose for His Rasool sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam a son-in-law and companions except those who are the best.

If the Rawaafidh (Shee'ah) are true to their claims, then could they explain why Rasoolullaah sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam did not forewarn the Ummah and clarify the alleged enmity of the Khulafaa ath-Thalaatha (ie Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthmaan radiallaahu anhum) towards Islam ?

Their insults and curses are not limited just to the Khulafaa ath-Thalaatha but are also directed towards Ali Radiallaahu anhu. Because Ali Radiallaahu anhu himself, in Masjid Rabia, gave the oath of allegiance (bai'ah) to Abu Bakr radiallaahu anhu and also gave his daughter, Umm Kulthum, Radiallahu anha, in marriage to Umar Radiallaahu anhu. He also willingly gave the oath of allegiance (bai'ah) to Uthmaan radiallaahu anhu. Not only this, but he was actually the right hand man and a well-wisher of the Khulafaa ath-Thalaatha. So could Ali radiallaahu anhu have chosen a kaafir as a son-in-law for himself ? And could Ali radiallaahu anhu have given the oath of allegiance (bai'ah) ,as he did, to a kaafir ? Subhaan Allaah! This indeed is a great accusation!

Also, by cursing Mu'aawiya radiallaahu anhu, these Rawaafidh (Shee'ah) are actually cursing Hasan Radiallaahu anhu. Because Hasan radiallahu anhu withdrew from, and gave up the Khilaafah to Mu'aawiya radiallaahu anhu purely for the pleasure of Allaah. Rasoolullaah sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam foretold of this in the hadeeth. So can the grandson of Rasoolullaah sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam actually have withdrawn from and left the Khilaafah in the hands of a Kaafir for him to rule over the people ? Subhaan Allaah! This indeed is a great accusation and insult!

If the Rawaafidh say that Ali and Hasan radiallahu anhumaa were forced into doing this, then this is proof enough that these Rawaafidh have no sense whatsoever. The accusations levelled against these two honoured companions of the Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam are the worst insults ever imaginable and are beyond belief.

Furthermore, how do these Rawaafidh curse and insult Umm ul Mu'mineen (mother of the Believers) A'isha radiallaahu anha when Allaah tabarak wa ta'aalaa Himself has mentioned her in the Qur'aan as the mother of the believers ?

Allaah tabaarak wa ta'aalaa says:

"The Prophet (sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam) is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their (believers) mothers (as regards respect and marriage)." (al-Ahzaab, verse 6)

There is no doubt whatsoever that only that person will curse and insult Umm al-Mu'mineen who does not consider her to be a mother. Because for one who does have a mother, does not curse and insult her, but loves her.

How then can there be any compromise between the Ahl-us-Sunnah and the Rawaafidh when the fact is that these Rawaafidh regard the leader of dalaalah (misguidance) [Khomeini](#) as sinless and one protected from committing sins ? They actually admit to this (that Khomeini is sinless and protected from sinning) because they consider him to be the deputy of their own [Mahdi](#) ("Muhammad son of al-Hasan al-Askari") - (not the awaited Mahdi of Ahl-usSunnah wal Jamaa'ah). The Mahdi about whom they maintain the belief that he is presently concealed in the cave called 'Samurah'.

Now, because Khomeini is the deputy of their Mahdi and the order of the deputy is essentially the order of the deputed, the Mahdi, therefore, here, their inference is that, as the awaited Mahdi is Ma'soom (protected from sinning) then Khomeini is also Ma'soom, being the Mahdi's deputy. Also these Rawaafidh do not content themselves with just this but they continue and maintain that all their Faqihs (scholars) are also Ma'soom and all these Faqihs hold the status of being close to Allaah (walee)!

As can be seen this is an open contradiction of their own beliefs. In this way they have actually destroyed the basis of their own religion. This is not surprising, because facts based on falsehood and lies always do clash and contradict with each other, and thus, a religion based on lies brings about its own destruction.

None of the Ahl-ul-Bayt (the family of the Holy Prophet sallallaahu alayhi wa sallam) subscribed to the false beliefs of these Rawaafidh (Shee'ah). There are numerous solid arguments based on logic and Shari'ah refuting their religion and false beliefs. These arguments are so many that it would be difficult to recount them all. Therefore they should repent from their Baatil Aqeedah (false and unfounded beliefs) and enter into the fold of Islam.

Therefore, we, Ahl-us-Sunnah, cannot be close to them even to the extent of a hair. As regards to Islam, these people (the shee'ah) are actually more dangerous than the Jews and the Christians. They should never and can never be trusted in any way whatsoever. In fact, Muslims must always lie in wait and constantly be in a state of defence against their evil plots and deceptions.

Allaah tabarak wa ta'aalaa says:

"They are the enemies, so beware of them. May Allaah curse them! How are they denying (or deviating from) the Right Path." (al-Munaafiqoon, verse 4)

These Rawaafidh (Shee'ah) actually descend from Abu Lu'luah Majoosi (a fire worshipper) and Abdullaah ibn Sabah Yahoodi (a Jew).

Therefore, O Muslims! There is no alternative for the Muslims but to differentiate between Haqq and Baatil in their beliefs and to consider good only what Allaah has declared as good, and to consider as condemned what Allaah has condemned and disapproved of.

All the Muslims should unite through mutual efforts and help because their enemies stand united against them in their Baatil religion and false beliefs. This is not new, they have always been unified against the Muslims throughout Islamic History. There is no possibility whatsoever that these Kuffaar can be or will ever be pleased with the Muslims.

Allah Ta'ala says:

"Never will the Jews nor the Christians be pleased with you till you follow their religion."

(The Noble Qur'an 2:120)

And He Ta'ala says:

"And they will never cease fighting you until they turn you back from your religion, if they can."

(The Noble Qur'an 2:217)

Thus the only reason for the creation of a Jewish, Zionist state in Palestine was to start an armed conflict with the Muslims and thus create tension and terror in the region. After they had succeeded in creating Israel, the Jewish colonial powers then set in motion such basic and collective plans which are a cause of deep pain for the Muslims, even till today. Among these the major plan was to

bring about a dissolution of all [Shara`ee](#) courts from the Islamic countries and establish [non-Islamic](#), man-made laws in their place. To a large extent the Kufaar have succeeded in their aim. But praise be to Allah [Ta`ala](#), that the Saudi government did not fall prey to this conspiracy and there still exists many [Shara`ee](#) courts in the country. Today, amongst all the Muslim governments of the world, the government of Saudi Arabia is the only representative, model of an Islamic government.

After succeeding in bringing about an end to all Islamic, [Shara`ee](#) courts in most of the Muslim countries, the Jews and Christians launched a new plan in order to find an excuse for military intervention in the area.

An insidious movement was started and such anti-Islamic, atheistic ideas and beliefs as those of insurrection, Communism, nationalism were instilled in the minds of the people. These consequently gave birth to such military tyrants as [Saddam Husain](#).

An open armed conflict with the holy [Sharee`ah](#) thus began. All the means at their disposal were brought upon to bear and the voices of [Haq](#) (Truth) crushed mercilessly. The conspiracies of the Kufaar bore fruit and thousands of families migrated to the western countries.

The countries which had become victims of military rule, became weaker and weaker in faith, in [Deen](#), due to Western influences.

In these countries, every succeeding government blamed the previous government for the havoc and destruction in the country. ([May Allah Ta`ala protect us](#)). And today conditions in some countries have declined to such an extent that offering [Salat Ba-Jama`at](#) is now considered to be a crime there - [La hawla wa la quwaata illa billah \(There is no might nor power except with Allah\)](#).

When such are the conditions how can one even think of Allah's [Ta`ala](#) divine assistance of religious honour and dignity?

With the establishment of a Jewish state, destruction of all [Shara`ee](#) courts in the Islamic countries and their replacement by [non-Islamic](#), man-made systems of law, circulation and formulation of groups and beliefs inimical and contrary to Islam, and as a result the emergence of such people as [Saddam](#), the stage was now set for the super powers to act upon their basic conspiracies;

To pave the way for a military intervention they purposely created a fake crisis. They were already in control of the economies of the region.

It is now no longer a secret that the great powers are planning upon dividing the land of Arabia into smaller states constantly at war with each other. For this will consolidate the forces of [Kufr](#), and provide protection for their anti-Islamic beliefs and deeds.

Remember, that the world powers are the [sworn](#) enemies of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, as it is the [greatest](#) centre of Islam, a fort of the Muslims. All the governments of the Kufaar are bent upon destroying it. In fact the forces of [Kufr](#) have now all united [against](#) Islam and the Muslims. [None of these countries can any longer be trusted.](#)

Specially so, as America and Britain are now openly threatening the kingdom's survival and safety. Thus their blatant enmity, evil intentions, destructive aims for Saudi Arabia have now become clear... are now common knowledge.

America!

It would do well for you to remember that Saudi Arabia is not alone. All the Muslims of the world, from the east to the west, are united in the defence of the holy land, the last centre of the Muslims.

The evil intentions and aims of the world powers are:

- * To strengthen and fortify the Zionist, Jewish state of Israel.
- * To tear down Al-Aqsa Mosque and build a synagogue in its place, thus satisfying the ancient desire of the Jews.
- * To maintain the military supremacy of the Jews over the Muslim Arab countries.
- * To appropriate a major part of the oil-wealth of the Gulf States for themselves, leaving the Saudis with the residue only.
- * To deal a death-blow to Islam at the slightest provocation.
- * To promote everything which is against Islam, which destroys the least morals and virtues bestowed by Islam, and which would cause the Islamic states to be constantly at war with each other.

O Muslim!

You should learn a lesson from Turkey where the **accursed** Kamal Ataturk established a secular form of government and forcefully subjected the Turks to an **irreligious (anti-Islamic), heathenish** system.

Not only was the Islamic system discarded but the Islamic principles were fiercely opposed on **every** front, so much so, that even today the government there is **hostile**, and **extremely harmful** to the Muslims. **It has made military pacts with the Jews**. But, in spite of all efforts by the Turkish government to curry their favour, the Kufaar are willing to tolerate the Turkish government **only** as long as it remains subservient and in service of the Jews.

Turkey sacrificed everything: Its religion, its principles for the Christian and Jews but none of the European countries are even now willing to let it join the European Union.

Why?

What is Turkey's crime?

Only that it once was an Islamic centre.

O Muslims!

Let Turkey be a moral to you.

Be sure, that you may renounce as many Islamic principles as you like, but the Kufaar will **never** be pleased with you.

So instead of trying to gain their favour, **you should adhere to your own religion.**

Remember, that this enmity of the Kufaar is based upon nothing else, but Islam. If this was not so, tell me; **why have the people of Iraq been suffering under sanctions for the last six years?** What is the crime of the poor Iraqi people, except that they are Muslims?

As far as **Saddam** and the ruling party are concerned, the sanctions have not effected them the least bit. The world powers justify these cruel sanctions against Iraq by saying that it violated a U.N. resolution.

Iraq violated only one, but the Jewish enemies have violated sixty U.N. resolutions.

It ("Israel") has not even signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, although this area is a veritable volcano and cannot bear the accumulation of weapons of mass destruction.

Saddam Husain cannot be absolved of all responsibility too. He is equally to blame for the atrocities committed against the people of Iraq, for he only complies with the wishes of the enemies of Islam. **He does whatever they wish him to.**

I am warning America to **stop interfering** in the affairs of our region. As far as the security of the religion is concerned, it is the responsibility of the Gulf states, **especially** Saudi Arabia itself, and not of America.

America, be not proud of your power.

It is a Sunnah of Allah **Ta'ala**, that whenever the weak were oppressed, the powerful oppressors were **destroyed**. Allah **Ta'ala** Himself causes their destruction.

America must not therefore be deceived by the apparent helplessness of the Muslims.

The Americans should learn a lesson from the Muslims of Afghanistan, who had started Jihad against Russia armed with sticks only. They had thus brought about the total destruction of the super power of the day. **Remember** that technological superiority is not everything. **The real power is that of faith, of Iman.**

The maintenance of peace and security in the Arabian peninsula lies with the governments of Arabia themselves. In fact, it is a **Fard** upon them to guard their borders. **There is no need for foreign intervention.**

In fact these foreign powers which stepped in to "**save**" Gulf States, are themselves **the cause** of the dangerous problems; the terrible anxieties that are afflicting the people there. The **modus operandi** of these powers of **Kufr** is that, wherever there is a crisis, even if it has been created by themselves, they jump in on the **pretext** of solving it. They propose to be helping the country out of its difficulties, **but in reality they become a grave danger to it:**

For, can a wolf ever guard a flock of sheep?

O people!

There is religious enmity between the Muslims and the Kufaar. [So how can they be the well-wishers of the Muslims?](#)

Although America is a Christian country, [its reins are in the hands of the Jews](#). America is powerless.

The Jews manipulate it, and exploit it for their own purposes. Still, the Muslims cannot tolerate the presence of the American military force in the holy land. They cannot - [will not](#) - suffer the presence of any power of [Kufr](#) in the Arabian peninsula - Rasoolullah ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)) said,

"No two religions can remain in Arabia."

The Holy Prophet's ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)) last advice was:

"Expel the Jews and Christians from the Arab lands."

Thus, now when the Jews and Christians have set up military bases in, and all around Arabia, it has become a [Fard](#) upon the Muslims to act upon the last order of Rasoolullah ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)) and [expel them from the Arab lands](#).

[O Muslims!](#)

[Impending doom is threatening you](#). Offer sincere repentance for your salvation. To save yourself from destruction and ruin repent, offer Taubah, to Allah [Ta'ala](#) for [all](#) your sins. Because of the sins committed by the people, causes ruin and destruction to attend upon them. [And in repentance lies their deliverance:](#)

[O you, who drank wine and thus disobeyed Allah Ta'ala; repent for your sin, for thus you will, through this Taubah, assist in the reformation of the society.](#)

[O you, who committed adultery or sodomy, turn to Allah Ta'ala, and offer sincere repentance for your disobedience.](#)

[O you, who disobeyed Allah Ta'ala by using drugs, offer Taubah before Allah Ta'ala, for verily to Him will you return shortly.](#)

[O you, who committed the disobedience of giving up offering Salat, repent before the Mighty Allah.](#)

[O you, who caused a loss to someone's honour or property, offer Taubah for having been cruel to a Muslim. Seek refuge with Allah Ta'ala.](#)

Purify your wealth from interest, for because of this evil destruction, wars descend upon a people. In matters of business, sale and purchase [keep away](#) from that which is contrary to the orders of the Holy Qur'an, to Sharee'ah. For in this way will all the transactions of a bank correspond to the orders of Islam.

[Call the people towards Allah](#). Establish firmly [D`awah-I lallah, D`awah-I lal Islam](#). Teach Islam to the people. Pay special attention to the [Madaris-e-Islamiyyah](#) (Islamic schools of Knowledge) established in the Muslim countries to provide religious knowledge to the people.

It is a **Fard** upon every Muslim to call others towards Allah **Ta'ala**, especially so upon the 'Ulama whose beliefs, knowledge and perseverance can be relied upon; the 'Ulama who are well versed in Islamic jurisprudence, to whom people turn too, for solutions to their religious problems.

O Muslim!

Avoid those groups which cause division and dissension; avoid the desires and temptations which lead you astray and cause disunity amongst you.

O Muslim!

Save yourself from the wrath and punishment of Allah **Ta'ala**.

Allah **Ta'ala** says:

"O you who believe! Take not as (your) Bitanah (advisors, consultants, protectors, helpers, friends, etc.) those outside your religion (pagans, Jews, Christians and hypocrites) since they will not fail to do their best to corrupt you. They desire to harm you severely. Hatred has already appeared from their mouths, but what their breasts conceal is far worse. Indeed We have made plain to you the ayat (proofs, evidences, verses) if you understand.

Lo! You are the ones who love them but they love you not, and you believe in all the Scriptures (i.e you believe in the Taurah and the Injeel, while they disbelieve in your Book, the Qur'an). And when they meet you, they say, "We believe". But when they are alone, they bite the tips of their fingers at you in rage. Say: "Perish in your rage. Certainly, Allah knows what is in the breasts (all the secrets)".

If a good befalls you, it grieves them, but if some evil overtakes you, they rejoice at it. But if you remain patient and become Al Muttaqun (the pious), not the least harm will their cunning do to you. Surely, Allah surrounds all that they do.

(The Noble Qur'an 3:118-120)

May Allah **Ta'ala** grant abundance in the Holy Qur'an for you and for me.

May He make recitation of the Holy Qur'an and dhikr beneficial for you and for me.

May He make following the instructions, and imitating the characteristics of Rasoolullah (**salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam**) profitable for us.

I invoke Allah **Ta'ala's** forgiveness for myself, for you, and for all the Muslims, for **all** the sins committed by us.

2nd Khutbah

All praise is for Allah who is friend to the virtuous. I bear witness that there is none other than Allah worthy of being worshipped; that He is **one**, and has no partner. It is He who gave honour to the Muslims and dishonoured the Kufaar. And I bear witness that our Prophet and leader

Muhammad ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)) is His bondsman and Messenger; a keeper of promises and trusts.

O Allah; bestow upon your Prophet and bondsman, Rasoolullah ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)) upon his descendants, upon the Sahabah-e-Kiram, your choicest blessings and favours.

Amma B'ad! (To Proceed!)

O Muslims!

Fear Allah [Ta'ala](#). For, He says:

"O you who believe! Answer Allah (by obeying Him) and (His) Messenger when he ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)) calls you to that which will give you life, and know that Allah comes in between a person and his heart (i.e. He prevents an evil person to decide anything). And verily to Him you shall (all) be gathered.

And fear the Fitnah (affliction and trial, etc.) which affects not in particular (only) those of you who do wrong (but it may afflict all the good and the bad people), and know that Allah is severe in punishment."

(The Noble Qur'an 8:24-25)

O Muslims!

Assemble together upon the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of Rasoolullah ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)). Act upon the orders of the Book of Allah [Ta'ala](#), and upon the Sunnah of Rasoolullah ([salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam](#)).

Every Muslim must turn to Allah, the Most Glorious.

All Islamic countries must have love for each other, they [must](#) be each others helpers and supporters. Especially so, in the face of the terrible danger which now confronts the Muslim countries.

It is the Kufaar's plan to interfere in the affairs of the Muslims in such a way so as to divide them, alienate them from each other and thus destroy them completely.

It is therefore [imperative](#) for all the Islamic countries, [especially](#) the Gulf States, to adopt a policy of mutual support and co-operation. It is essential for the Gulf States not to accept any individual opinion or controversial decision in matters of collective interest. None of the Gulf States should pass any resolution without consulting the Saudi government first; because upon this kingdom depends the existence and continuation of these states. These Gulf countries, [after](#) deriving strength from Allah [Ta'ala](#), depend upon Saudi Arabia for their solidarity too.

The kingdom is a pillar of strength for these states. It is also incumbent upon all these countries not to provide any military bases to the enemies of Allah for strikes upon Iraq.

For Allah [Ta'ala](#) has created all the Muslims as one single body, and providing bases to the [anti](#)-Islamic forces will only cause suffering to the Muslims of Iraq. Although a solution to the Iraqi

problem seems to be imminent, the world powers **cannot** be depended upon **not** to create a new crisis for the achievement of their own selfish ends.

So they must not be allowed to find an ally in the Arabian countries.

Furthermore, the Arabian countries must not allow the aircraft carriers of America or **any other Kufriah** country to use their harbours for launching attacks upon **any** Muslim country. Nor should they allow the establishment of military bases on their land.

O Muslim! Fear Allah only.

It is necessary upon all Islamic and Arab countries to fully co-operate with, and assist Saudia Arabia in **expelling** the anchored warships, and the stationed Christian and Jewish troops from the Arab lands. For, Rasoolullah (**salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam**) has said:

"Two religions cannot co-exist in Arabia."

The governments of this region are fully aware of their responsibility and of the necessity to maintain peace. If only it is rendered safe and secure from the interference of the "big powers" there would remain no danger to its existence.

O Muslim!

Become each others helpers and supporters.

Be well aware of the fact that these Kufaar are **envious** of you. They even envy your pleasant atmosphere, for the skies of their cities are polluted with smoke from their factories etc., their places of worship are redolent with the **evil** of their sins, with the depravity of the deeds disliked by Allah Ta'ala. They begrudge you, your every possession.

And the greatest thing they are envious of is your faith, your morals.

O people of Allah,

Fear Him as is His due, and listen to the saying of Rasoolullah (**salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam**):

"Very soon, other nations will invite others and fall upon you to attack and destroy you, just like people who, inviting others, fall upon a dish of food."

The Sahaba-e-Kiraam asked Rasoolullah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam**):**

"Ya Rasulullah! Will this happen because we will be lesser in number at that time?" "No." Rasoolullah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam**) answered. "You will be great in number, but you will be like froth upon the main, and weak as sticks and straws. Allah Ta'ala will remove, from the hearts of your enemies, their awe and terror of you, and He shall fill your hearts with wahn." Sahaba-ul-Kiraam (**Radhiallaahu Ta'ala 'Anhum**) asked "What is wahn?"**

**"Love of the world, and hatred for death,"
Rasulullah (**Sallallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam**) answered.**

O people of Allah!

Verily Allah Ta'ala and His angels send down blessings upon the Rasoolullah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam).

O people of Faith

You too send Durood and Sallam upon the Holy Prophet. Rasoolullah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam) has said:

"The person who sends Durood upon me once is blessed by Allah Ta'ala ten times."

So send Durood upon the first, and last Prophet (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam). Allahumma sallee 'ala Muhammad.

Ya Allah, bestow your choicest blessings (Rahmah) upon Rasoolullah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam) as you bestowed blessings (Rahmah) upon Ibraheem ('alayhee sallam). Verily, you are worthy of all praise, most eminent and exalted. And bestow barakah' upon Rasoolullah (salallaahu 'alayhee wa sallam) as you did upon Ibraheem ('alayhee sallam).

Verily are You worthy of all praise, most glorious and eminent.

Ya Allah bestow your approval upon the Khulafa-ul-Rashideen Abu Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthman and 'Ali and all the Sahaba-ul-Kiraam (Radhiallaahu 'Anhum).

O Lord of the universe, be pleased with those who follow all of them in the best possible way.

Ya Allah! O Most Merciful of the merciful, grant us your divine approval too.

Ya Allah! Confer upon the Muslims and Islam, honour and victory, and upon Kufr and the Kufaar; dishonour and defeat.

Ya Allah! consign the leaders of the Kufaar to the most grievous penalty. Impress upon their faces, in their conversation conflict and dissension.

Ya Allah! whoever bears enmity towards Islam and the Muslims, destroy him completely.

Ya Allah! Lord of the universe, cause the powers of Kufr to go to war with each other. Turn them away from the Muslims, and engage them in fighting each other.

Ya Allah! Make the conspiracies and stratagems of the enemies of Islam, ineffectual and useless.

Ya Allah! Whoever bears malice and ill-will towards us and our cities, make their maliciousness rebound upon themselves. Intervene between us and the evil they intend.

Ya Allah, Lord of the universe verily you have power over everything. We present you before every Kafir and his opposition. We seek your help against them. We defend ourselves against the Mushrikeen through you.

Ya Allah! Seize the Jews and Christians in the grip of your punishment. Seize the Hindus and the Mushrikeen as well.

Ya Allah! Send down upon them a torment most grievous which is not turned away from a guilty nation.

Ya Allah! They have filled the entire world with tyranny, oppression and sins.

Ya Allah, we seek Your help against them. We seek Your protection against their evil.

Ya Allah, we seek only Your shelter against the mischief of the Rawafidh (plural of Raafidhah; Shi'ah), the heretics. You are omnipotent indeed.

Ya Allah! Create affection in the hearts of the Muslims for each other. Reform them, guide them to the paths of safety and peace. Draw them out from the Darkness into the Light, Assist them against Your own, and their enemies.

Our Lord, grant us beneficence in this world and in the Akhirah too. Save us from the torment of Jahannam.

Ya Allah! Provide safety to our Imam and grant him the opportunity to perform those deeds which are to Your liking, which are acceptable to You.

Ya Allah! Include him among those who guide others to the right path, who are the guided ones themselves.

Ya Allah, assist him in religious and worldly matters.

Ya Allah, when matters are of a delicate nature, when it is difficult to recognize Haq (The Truth - what is Right), to act upon it, guide them towards what is Haq.

Ya Allah, set straight their 'batin'.

Ya Allah! Lord of the universe, grant the Muslims the ability to perform deeds which are worthy of Your approval, which can gain Your divine favour.

O people of Allah!

Allah commands you to do justice. He commands you the doing of good, and liberality to kith and kin, and He forbids all shameful deeds, and injustice and rebellion: He instructs you, that you may receive admonition.

"And fulfil the Covenant of Allah (Bai'ah: pledge for Islam) when you have covenanted, and break not the oaths after you have confirmed them - and indeed you have appointed Allah your surety. Verily, Allah knows what you do."

(The Noble Qur'an 16:91)

Remember Allah, who is Great and Glorious and He will remember you. And give thanks unto Him for the many favours He has bestowed upon you, Allah will grant you more. Remembrance (dhikr) of Allah is a great thing indeed.

And Allah knows well whatever it is that you do.

To hear the Sheikh's original Khutbah in Arabic, go to the following address which is situated on the Homepage of the "Bader Islamic Association":
<http://home.ica.net/~fsaleh/listen.htm>

The Creed Of Shi'a From Their Own Sources

Allah

- 1.) He has the Quality of 'Badaa'.
- 2.) This means he forgets.
- 3.) He makes mistakes.
- 4.) He plans but this does not take effect.
- 5.) He does not know who to appoint as the next message conveyer, the next Imaam.
- 6.) "We (shias) do not worship such a god who gives authority to rascals like Yazid, Mu'awiyah and Uthmaan."
- 7.) They say "Ali says.....I am the first and I am the last. I am the manifest and I am the hidden and I am the heir of earth."
- 8.) Shias say that the Imaams are the face of Allaah,
- 9.) The eyes of Allaah among his creation.
- 10.) The tongue of Allaah among his creation.

References :

- (1.) Usul Kafi- Babul bad'aa - Al- Kafi Vol- 1 -P283 India Ed. (2.) Ibid (3.) Ibid .(4.) Ibid. (5.) Ibid. (6.) Kashful Asraar - 107 - Khomeni.. (7.) Rijaal Kashsi . 138. India Print. (8.) Usul- e-Kaafi -83. (9.) Ibid. 10.) Ibid.

New Kalimah (Testimony Of Faith)

- 1.) Laa ilaaha illaahu Muhammadur Rasulullaah -Ali waliyullah, Khomeni Hujjatulillaah
- 2.) Laa Ilaaha Muhammdur - Rasulullah, Ali waliyullah wazi Rasulullah was Khalifauhu bila Faslein"
- 3.) - Shia 'Islaam' based on 5 pillars - Salaat, Zakaat, Fasting, Hajj, Wilaayat.
- 4.) - Azaan is "Ash Hadu Anna - alian Waliullah Wasu Rasulullah was Khalifatu hu bila faslrin"

References:

- (1.) Wahdat Islaami - June 84 P1- monthly Iranian Government. Periodical. (2.) Ali Waliullah - Abdul Kareem Mushtaq. (3.) Usul- Kafi. 4.) Listen in Arafaat.

Imaamology

- 1.) They believe in 12 Imaams after Rasulullaah ﷺ.
- 2.) First being Ali (R.A).
- 3.) Last being the 12th Imaam
- 4.) Who is in a Cave 'Surra - Man- Raa'.
- 5.) Imaams they believe are Masoom- innocent.
- 6.) They can make Halaal- Haraam and Haraam - Halaal .
- 7.) They can change Deen- Sharia.
- 8.) They are born of their mothers thighs.
- 9.) They have the knowledge of the Unseen.
- 10.) They say Imaams are higher in status than the Ambiyaa including our Nabi ﷺ.
- 11.) No concession regarding Wilaayah- (absolute necessary belief).
- 12.) If one does not accept Imaams then one is a Kaafir.

References:

- (1.) Usul -e - Kafi. (2.) Usul -e - Kafi. (3.) Usul -e - Kafi. (4.) Usul -e - Kafi. (5.) Usul -e - Kafi Vol 1

P225 / Kafi - Kitaabul Hujjuah. (6.) Usul -e - Kafi Vol 1 P225. (7.) Ibid. (8.) Ibid /Haqqul Yaqeen P126.(9.) Usul -e - Kafi Vol 1 P225. (10.) Ibid / Al Hukumatul - Islaamiyaa - 52 Khomeni. Hayaatul Qutoob Vol 3, P10 /Ibid Vol 2. P787. Footnote. (11.) Usul -e- Kafi Vol 2. P278. (12.) Usul -e- Kafi Vol 1. P225.

The 12th Imaam

- 1.) When he comes he will bring the original Quraan.
- 2.) He is in hiding, in a cave.
- 3.) He is alive observing the world, in totallity.
- 4.) When he comes, he will be naked. Rasulullaah ﷺ will swear Allegiance to him. (Allaah protect us).
- 5.) He will first dig the grave of Abu Bakr (R.A) and Umar (R.A),then hang them on a stake - for all sins of mankind.
- 6.) He will remove the body of Ayesha (R.A) and implement the same punished for Zina.
- 7.) He will then kill the Sunni Scholars.
- 8.) Punish the Muslim Ummuah.
- 9.) First kill Ahle - Sunnah, then Ulama, then Kuffar.

References:

(1.) Usul-e- Kafi. (2.) Islaamic Goverment P42/ Usul -e- Kafi P340. (3.) Hukumatal Islaamia -P52. (4.) Haqqul Yaqeen 2/227- 2/347. (5.) Haqqul Yaqeen P 361/2. (6.) Also Vol 2 P 611/ Haqqul Yaqeen - P 347/ Mullah Baqir Majlisi. (7.) Furoo Kafi - Kitaabul Raudah - P 527 also Tafseer Majmanul Bayan/ Hayaatul Qulub Vol2 P 611. (8.) Hayaatul Qulub Vol2 P 611.(9.) Haqqul Yaqeen-Vol 2. P 527 ASlo Maj Manul Bayaan.

Qur'aan

- 1.) Not Completed.
- 2.) Has 17,000 Aayats.
- 3.) Our's has 6,666.
- 4.) Abu Bakr's opposed the text of the Quraan.
- 5.) Original Quraan with 12th Imaam Mahdi.
- 6.) Do not produce Haafiz.
- 7.) Do not perform Taraweeh.
- 8.) Quraan will be read/ learnt when 12th Imaam brings it.
- 9.) Ali (R.A) showd original Quraan to Sahabah(R.A) who rejected it.
- 10.) Passages mentioning virtures of Ali(R.A) has been purposefully deleted from the Quraan.
- 11.) There are 2,000 shiah traditions making many additions and subtractions in Quraan.
- 12.) The 'Murtaddeen'- renegrades have removed the name of Ali (R.A).

References:

(1.) Usul Kafi 1:228/ Faslul Kitaab fi Tahrif. Kitaabi Raabul Arbaa of Nuri Tibarsi approved by Khomeni in ' Al- Hukumaat -ul- Islamiyaa". (2.) Usul Kafi P671. (3.) Usul Kafi P671. (4.) Kashful Asraar P111.(5.) Usul Kafi 2-632. (6.) See Iran. (7.) See Iran. (8.) Usul Kafi - p622. (9.) Maqbool - 1067 - Usul Kafi Vol1 P228. (10.)Tafseer Ali Qummi-308 /Usul Kafi 1:416/Footnotes of Maqbool's translation 637/ Al- Ihtijaj- Tabarsi- 1-254/ Tafseer of Saafi- 1- 32/ Muqaddamah 6 , from Tafseer Saafi P32 Vol -1. (11.) Usul Kafi 1:228/ Faslul Kitaab fi Tahrif. Kitaabi Raabul Arbaa of Nuri Tabarsi. (12.) Surah Muhammad, Ayat 9, Para 26- Molvi Maqbool Dehli P1011.

Taqiyyah (Essentially Means To Lie To Hide The Truth)

- 1.) The believe in Taqiyya.
- 2.) This means 'Holy Deception'.

- 3.) To believe in something but express/ say something else.
- 4.) They say 9-10th of Deen is Taqiyya.
- 5.) They say, he who has no Taqiyya has no deen.
- 6.) There is a great reward in Lying.
- 7.) They say the great Imams Practised 'Taqiyya'.
- 8.) They say Alli (R.A), Hassan (R.A), Hussain(R.A) practiced 'Taqiyya'.
- 9.) They say Hussein (R.A) practiced 'Taqiyya'.
- 10.) Perform Jamaah salaah with Sunni's.
- 11.) Visit their sick .
- 12.) Perform their Janazah Salaah.

References:

- (1.) Usul -e- Kafi. (2.) Ibid. (3.) Ibid. (4.) Ibid. (5.) Ibid. (6.) Ibid. (7.) Islaamic Government P35/ 133 .
- (8.) Ibid. (9.) Ibid. (10.) Usul -e- Kafi. (11.) Ibid.(12.) Ibid.

Sahaabah (Companions)

- 1.) They say all Sahabah (R.A) companions except 3 left Islaam after demise of Nabi ﷺ.
- 2.) They say Abu Bakr(R.A) Umar(R.A) and Uthmaan (R.A) robbed Ali(R.A) of his position of being Khalif.
- 3.) They say Umar(R.A) was a 'Original Kaafir' and 'Zindiq'-renegade.
- 4.) "Abu Huraira (R.A) was one of the fuqaha, but god knows what judgement he falsified for Muaw'iyah and others like him, and what damage He inflicted upon Islaam."
- 5.) They say Abu Huraira (R.A) used to fabricate Ahadith.
- 6.) They say Muawiyah (R.A) poisoned Hassan(R.A).
- 7.) They say Muawiyah (R.A) was a tyrant oppressive ruler.
- 8.) They say Qazi Shurray (R.A) used to issue judicial pronouncement in favour of the ruling party. He was a sinful wretch occupying position of Judge.
- 9.) One should dissociate with the 4 idols: Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthmaan, Muawiyah and 4 women Ayesha, Hafsa, Harid, Umm-al-Hakam.
- 10.) One should curse the above after each prayer.
- 11.) Pharaoh and Hamaan refer here to Abu Bakr and Umar.

References:

- (1.) Anwaar - No'maan Niyyah - P245. Vol 2. Nimatullah Jafaari./ Furu Kafi, Kitaabul Raudah :15 - Mullah Muhammad bin Yaqoob Kulaini Vol 3 P115/ Usul -e-Kafi Vol 2, P 246 Rijaal Kashsi P504.
- (2.) Al- Ihtijaaj - Tibrasi 83, 84./Haqqul Yaqeen, P 157. (3.) Haqqul Yaqeen , 551/Kashful Asraar P119. (4.) P 143 - Islam government. (5.) Islaamic Government (6.) Al-Anwaar un Nomaniyyah - Vol 2. P88-87 Jazaari.(7.) Ibid. (8.) P81, Isl/ gov. (9.) Haqqul Yaqeen- Vol. 2 P519/ Furu Kaafi P342 Vol 3/ Jilaa - ul- Uyoom -P45 - 46/ Hayaatul Quluub P 375. (10.) Ainul Hayaa P559. (11.) Haqqul Yaqeen P342.

Sahaabah

- 12.) Faathima should complain about Ali's big stomach, no wealth and bad features.
- 13.) Abu Bakr and Umar are Kaafirs
- 14.) Abu Bakr is calf on Bani Israel.
- 15.) Ali is a mosquito and a fly.
- 16.) What did the Zuleikha of Makkah, Bibi Ayesha have, that the 50 year old Nabi ﷺ got moved to her.
- 17.) Nabi ﷺ accepted (in marriage) an uncouth person such as Hafsa. Not withstanding the fact that she was a widow and facially deformed.
- 18.) Imaan refers to Ameerul- Mu'mineen- Alli Kufr refers to Abu Bakr fisq(weakness) refers To Umar isyaan(disobedient) Uthmaan in Surah Hujuraat.
- 19.) Umar is an illegitimate child.
- 20.) Abu Bakr and Umar are worse than Shaithaan and they are dwellers of Jahannam.
- 21.) "When I entre Makkah and Madinah as the conqueror, my first duty will be to go to the grave of

Huzoor ﷺ and exhume the bodies of the two idols."

22.)"We shia's know the three Sahabah's(Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthmaan) as being void of Imaan"

References:

(12.) Mullah Baqir - Jilal Uyoon- 58 Chapter on Faathima.(13.) Haqqul Yaqeen - P552. (14.) Haqqul Yaqeen - Tafseer Qummi P160. (15.) Tafseer Qummi P29. (16.) Haqeeat Fiqh Hanafi P64 /Ghulaam Hussain Naqui.(17.) Ibid P124.(18.) Usul-e- Kafi P229. Vol 2.(19.) Tazkiratul Aamma - P103-4.(20.) Haqqul Yaqeen - P509 - 510.(21.) Kitaab be Noujawanaan - P8.(22.) Tajalliyaar-e-Sadaqaat - P201- Muhammed Hussain Dhelvi.

Mut'a (Temporary Marriage, Legalised Prostitution)

- 1.) "It is disliked but permissible to have Muta with a prostitute, especially(it will be more enjoyable) if she is famous for her prostitution."
- 2.)One time 'Muta' reward is Jannat.
- 3.)When the couple sit in Solitude, angels protect them.
- 4.)Their Speech is Tasbeeh .
- 5.)When they touch hands, sins fall from their fingers.
- 6.)When they Kiss, reward of Hajj and Umrah for both.
- 7.)On bathing - every drop from each hair brings reward of 10 Thawabs, 10 sins drop, stages raised by 10 fold.
- 8.)From every drop of water, angels created to make Tasbeeh till Qiyaamat.
- 9.)'Muta' with believing women is like 70 times journey to Ka'aba.
- 10.) Contractors of 'Muta' will cross the 'Pul Siraat' like a flash of lightning.
- 11.) After making muta Once - The stage of Hussain is reached. After making muta twice - The stage of Hasan is reached. After making muta thrice- The stage of Ali is reached. After making Muta Fourth- The satge of Rasulullaah ﷺ is reached

References:

(1.) Tahrirul Wasillah Vol-2 P292. (2.) Ujul - e- Hasana P15. (4.) bid.(5.) Ibid.(6.) Ibid. (7.) Ibid. (8.) Ibid. (9.) Ujul - e- Hasana P16.(10.) Ujul - e- Hasana P17. (11.) Tafseer Mianjajus Sadiqeen 1:356.

General

- 1.) They have their own Quraan.
- 2.) They have their own Ahadith Books(Usul-e-Kafi) etc.
- 3.) They do not believe in our Ahadith Kitaabs- Bukhari etc.
- 4.) They have their own Fiqh, Fiqh - Jafari.
- 5.) They have their own concept about Allaah.
- 6.) They believe that Imaams get 'Wahy' Divine Revelation.
- 7.) Their Aqaaid, Salaat, Azaan, Hajj, Fiqh is different.
- 8.) The concept of Ambiyaa (A.S) is different (they failed).
- 9.) Their concept of Sahaabah (R.A) is different.
- 10.) They Practice 'Muta'(Temporary Marriages) .
- 11.) Terms of Sehri and Iftaar are different.
- 12.) Ghysl for the dead is different.

References:

(1.) Usul-e-Kafi .(6.) Usul -e-Kafi .(7.) Usul-e-Kafi Vol2 P278/ Tafseer - al- Waeelah Vol 1 P280.(8.) Ijtihaad - wa- yak- jihati- Khomeni -15/ Islaamic Government P37/ Tehtan Times 29 June 1980/ Knomeni Imaam Mahdi Celebration. (11.) Tafseer - al- Waeelah Vol.(12.) Ibid.

General

- 13.) 4 Imaams are dogs.
- 14.) Ummah like Swine's.
- 15.) Ayesha and Hafsa are both Hypocrites
- 16.) Ayesha and Hafsa - Poisoned Nabi ﷺ before his death.
- 17.) May Allaah curse them (Ayesha/Hafsa) and their fathers (Abu Bakr and Umar).
- 18.) Their religion of the state of Iran is Islaam and Jafaari, Ithna Ashaari. This basis is forever, and it is not open to any amendment nor abrogation.
- 19.) Everybody, except us Shites are illegitimate.
- 20.) Nasabi group are those who preferred Abu Bakr and Umar over Ali.
- 21.) It is true that Allaah has not created anything more despicable than dogs.
- 22.) But the Nasabi is even more despicable than dogs in the eyes of Allaah.
- 23.) People of Makkah openly refute existence of Allaah.
- 24.) People of Madinah 70 times more unclean and polluted than people of Makkah.

References:

(13.) Tazkiratul Aimmah P102- Baqir majlisi.(14.) Usul-e-Kafi Vol2 P337.(15.) Hayatul Qutub - 2:745-M.B.Majlis.(16.) Maqbool Dehlavi - Imaam Baqir- Surah Ali Imraan : 134.(17.) Ibid.(18.) Constitution . (19.) Furoo - Kafi in Kitaabul Raudah - 135/245.(20.) Haqqul Yaqeen 521.(21.) Ibid 2/516. (22.) Ibid 2/516/ Ilaalus Sharaa P299 - Shaykh Saduq. Usul-e-Kafi P410 Vol ...(23.) Ibid.

General Ummah

- 1.) Most dirty and polluted left over water is that of a sunni.
- 2.) Not permissible to marry sunni because they are Kaafir.
- 3.) Cannot eat animal slaughtered by sunni.
- 4.) Sunnis created from soul of Jahannam.
- 5.) Shia's created from soul of Jannat.

References:

(1.) "Manlaa Yahuruldul Faqiah" - Vol 1. P8.(2.) Tahdhidul Akaam/ Ibid Vol 3 P258. (3.) Ibid.(4.) Usul - e- Kafi. (5.) Ibid.

Fiqh Examples

- 1.) Folding right hand on left hand in Salaat breaks Salaat.
- 2.) Sex in one's wives anus permissible.
- 3.) The 9th act which breaks Salaat is saying of 'Amen' intentionally after Sura Faatiha. But this, too, is Permissible under Taqaiyyah.
- 4.) No cover over the head in Ihraam .

References:

(1.) Tafseer - al- Waseelah. (2.) Tafseer - al- Waseelah- Vol.1 P280. (3.) Ibid. (4.) See - Hajj time.

Our Action

Fataawa of Rasulullah ﷺ

There is a specific Hadith about Rafida: "A sect is going to emerge who will be known by a bad connotation. They will be called Rafida. They will come neither on Friday nor in the congregational prayers. They will vilify the first generation (of Ummah). You should neither keep their company nor dine with them, nor have matrimonial relationship with them. If they fall ill do not go to greet them and if they die do not participate in their funeral prayers."

THUS :

- 1.) Shia's because of their (peculiar) beliefs are outside the pale of Islaam and as such Kafir's. Hence Islaamic bonds like :
- 2.) Marriage with them ;
- 3.) Using their Zabiah (Slaughter) ;
- 4.) Saying the funeral prayer of their dead ones ;
- 5.) Allowing them to participate in the funeral prayer of Sunni Muslims;
- 6.) Making them shares in Qurbani i.e. sacrificial animals on Eid-ul-Adha ;
- 7.) Making them witness in the nikah of sunni Muslims ;
- 8.) Accepting their monetary contributions for the building of Massjid ----- all these things are not permissable (in Shariah) and should be given up forthwith.

Anyone who does not do so is outside the pale of Islaam and is similarly a Kaafir like the Shia's.

Mufti Afzal Hoosen Elias

What The Shi'ites Say About Sunni Muslims

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Islam, what I am going to show you is the truth about what the Shi'ites think of us Sunni Muslims. The Shi'ites may tell you that we are the same and that they love us but beware because the Shi'ites also believe that it is okay and that they will get lots of reward for lying to Sunni Muslims about what they believe in....Below is the truth that the Shi'ites tried to hide from us for so long, it exposes the pure hatred that they hold against the Sunni Muslims. (the Shi'ites practise Taqayyah which means to conceal or lie about their beliefs)

Mohammad bin Al-hassan Toosi reports on the authority of Ishhaq bin Ammar, that Abu Abdullah said **"The wealth, the property and everything which belongs to a Sunni is actually yours (is legal for you)"** (Tahzib-ul Ahkam, Vol. 2 Kitabul Makasib, p. 116, published in Iran) above in this Shi'ites book it states that all Shi'ites can steal from any Sunni Muslim and that there is nothing wrong with that.

Moallah Khonas reported that Abdullah said **"snatch the possessions of a Sunni wherever you find it and hand over my share (ie. One fifth) to me"** (Tahzib ul Ahkam). Brothers and Sisters in Islam these Shi'ites think that they can steal our possessions and who knows what else they would like to do to us Sunni Muslims!

The Shi'ites say this regarding Sunni Muslims **"Although Allah, the Exalted, has not created a creature worse than a dog, yet a Nasbi (ie. A Sunni) is worse than even a dog."** (Haqqul Yakeen (Persian) Vol 2, P. 516) Here the Shi'ites have said that Sunni Muslims are worse than *Dogs!*

The Shi'ites say that we will never go to Paradise! **"It is contained in several sources of information that they, (the assumed Imams of Shias) said: 'Should every angel that Allah, the Exalted and Gracious, has created, every prophet that Allah has appointed, every truthfull martyr, (collectively) pray to Allah, the Exalted and Gracious, to release a Nasbi (a Sunni) from the Hell, Allah would never release him."** (Haqqul-Yaqeen, (Arabic), Vol. 2 P. 192) This is what the Shi'ites really think about us!!! They say that if anyone who is a Sunni Muslim will go to Hell!!! Don't these Shi'ites know what they are saying??

This is what the Shi'ites say will happen when their so-called Imams will return **"When Qaem alaihissalam appears, he will start slaughtering Sunnis and their Ulema before slaughtering the infidels (kuffar)."** (By the term "Quem" the Shi'ites mean Imam Mahdi, their twelveth Imam) So here the Shi'ites state that we are not Muslims, and that we are worse than the infidels (kuffar)

So dear Brothers and Sisters, how can the Shi'ites expect us to be friends with them when they Insult us and call us Kauffar behind our backs. So when a Shi'ite Insults a Sunni he is also Insulting all the Scholars and all of those pious people in Islam, can't these Shi'ites see what is wrong with their own beliefs???

May Allah Guide the Shi'ites to the True Islam, and May Allah show us what the Shi'ites really are, Ameen.

What The Shi'ites Say About Their 12 Imams?

Dear Muslim Brothers and Sisters in Islam, below is some of the lies that Shi'ites say about their 12 Imams, as some of you might have already known that the Shi'ites are different in many aspects of Islam..... But I'll tell you that the Shi'ites are Not Muslims since they insult Islam with all of their superstitions and lies about their 12 Imams, here are some of the many things that the Shi'ites say about their Imams. (please read all the other articles on shi'ites on this site)

"All the Imams are infallible just like the prophets. The Shi'ites derive their religion from their immaculate Imams" (Ibid, p. 22) Well this is a clear statement of kufr from the Shi'ites, as you can see they admit that they derive their religion from their Imams, well this means that if a Shi'ite Imam made something that in the Qur'an was lawful, forbidden, the Shi'ites would follow their Imams... by this statement the Shi'ites have taken themselves outside Islam.

"By listening to the voice of a person, the Imams can tell if the person was destined to go to hell or to heaven; they would thus answer his questions accordingly" (Usool al Kafi, p. 185) Dear Brothers and Sisters, as you can see the Shi'ites make their Imams out to be some God-like being, can't they see that this is [Shirk](#) (worshipping other than Allah, or associating partners with him).

"The Imams possess all the knowledge granted to angels, prophets and messengers" (Al-Kulaini, Al-kaafi, p.255.) Well here is more shirk from the Shi'ites... How can an Imam, who is just a human, know the Unseen??? Only Allah knows the Unseen, and think about this... The Imams were not even Alive at the time of all of the prophets so here is a major contradiction in the Shi'ite faith!

"The Imams know when they will die, and they do not die except by their own choice" (Ibid, p: 258.) Now, this is a clear statement of [kufr](#). Only Allah knows when a man will die! And these Shi'ites say that their Imams can control when they die?? This is major kufr and shirk for any one to believe in all the things that the Shi'ites say about their Imams!

"The Imams have knowledge of whatever occurred in the past and whatever will happen in the future, and nothing is concealed from them" (Ibid, p. 260.) Subhanallah!! Only Allah knows the future for any person to say that these Imams know the Unseen is committing Shirk and takes himself outside Islam.

"The Imams have knowledge of all the revealed books, regardless of the languages in which they were revealed" (Ibid, p. 227.) As you can see these Shi'ites have elevated their Imams to a God-like level, and the Shi'ites say that there is nothing wrong with this!!! Now can we see why the Shi'ites are different to us muslims!

"No one compiled the Qur'an completely except the Imams, and they encompass all of its knowledge" (Ibid, p. 228) So since the Qur'an was not compiled by the Imams then does that mean that the Quran is fabricated????? These Shi'ites want to even destroy Islam... look at what they say, they even insult the Qur'an!! And it is a well known fact that the Shi'ites have their own Qur'an (On this web site we have an article all about the false lies that the Shi'ites put in their own so called Qur'an).

"Signs of the prophets are possessed by the Imams" (Ibid, p. 231.) The Shi'ites have once again elevated their Imams to a very high level. The Imams they refer too are only human! So why do the Shi'ites worship them.

"When the Imams' time comes, they will rule in accordance with the ruling of the prophet David and his dynasty. These Imams will not need to ask for

presentation of evidence before passing their judgments" (Ibid,p. 397.) The Shi'ites even think that their Imams can do **what ever** they want!! Here they say that their Imams can just pass judgment on anybody! And they say that their Imams will not rule by the Qur'an but will rule by the laws of David!! (All Muslims **must** rule by the Qur'an and Sunnah). This is a proof that the awaited Imam of the Shi'ites is not the one that Muslims believe in but he is indeed the Anti-Christ (A'war al-Dajjal). The one that all Jews are waiting for him.

"There is not a single truth possessed by a people save that which originated with the Imams, and everything which did not proceed from them is false" (Ibid, p.277.) The Shi'ites have proven themselves to be non-Muslims please dear brothers and sisters look at what these Shi'ites are saying, understand that the Shi'ites are really **NOT** Muslims!

Dear Muslim Brothers and Sisters, above is only a small fraction of what Shi'ites say about their Imams... their are many many Shi'ite books claiming the same thing as above about their Imams. So my Brothers and Sisters how can we call these Shi'ites 'Muslim' after what they say about their Imams, If a person worships Idols and does not follow the Qur'an is he a Muslim???? now the Shi'ites worship their Imams and they raise their Imams word over the Qur'an (they say that their Imams word abrogates the Qur'an), so dear Muslims make du'a that Allah guides us on the straight path and exposes the lies that the Shi'ites attribute to Islam, **Ameen!**

The Practice Of Lying In The Shi'ite Faith

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Islam, what I am going to tell you is something that all of us muslims should know about the Shi'ites, this fundamental thing will show us why the Shi'ites can't be trusted, and why the Shi'ites are such of an enemy to Islam, this article of the Shi'ite faith called Taqayyah (concealment, deception or lying) lets the Shi'ites betray us and lie about Hadeeth and the Quran, this is also why a Shi'ite can never be used as a witness, or why he can not narrate Hadeeth, I myself have when talking to Shi'ites have found out that they always lie about Hadeeth for example on of them told me that there was a Hadeeth in Bukhari cursing all of the sahabah, so I asked him for the proof and he said that he had it, so he gave me a page full of references, all which were irrelevant and have nothing to do with this hadeeth. Another Shi'ite once added on a verse to the quran and tried to tell me that this was the quran when I asked for references again he just refused to tell me, since then that Shi'ite has not been around since.

I also warn all you muslims against the "Muslim" chat rooms, as there are many Shi'ites in them, I have found way over 10 who were on at one time you see they pretend to be Sunni Muslims but they try to infiltrate us by quoting their false Hadeeth and try to mislead us, as they trully despise us Muslims. So dear brothers below is evidence that Shi'ites are allowed to lie and not only that, but encouraged to lie to us Muslims.

Please note that the Shi'ites attribute the following to Abu Abdullah (Ja'far as-Sadiq):

"Mix with them(i.e. non-shia) externally but oppose them internally." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.116) now this Shi'ite hadeeth means that they should mix with us and try to decieve us..It trully shows us Muslims what the Shi'ites are!

"He who conceals his religion has saved it, and he who makes it public has destroyed it." now this contradicts the Quran as will be shown below.

"A believer who does not dissimulate is like a body without a head." (Tafseer al-Askari) It is also interesting that the Shi'ites article of Faith "Taqayyah" is just like what the Talmudites (jews who follow the Talmud) say about the Goyyims (non-jews,) as all Talmudites say that they should lie to us non-jews..You see this explains a lot about the Shi'ites and their Similarities with the Jews as the Shi'ite sect was started by Abdullah bin Saba'. (a Jew who started the shi'ite religion, just with the intent of trying to destroy the Muslims..this in explained in the article **"Who founded the Shi'ite Religion"**)

"Nine tenths of religion is taqiyyah (dissimulation), hence one who does not dissimulate has no religion." (Al-Kafi vol.9 p.110) This shows us that Shi'ites have to lie to us as if they don't then they will not be called Muslims by other Shi'ites....it shows us how sick is the Shi'ite faith.

Concerning the verse, **"Verily the most noble of you in Allah's sight is the most God-fearing (atqaakum)"**, the Shia attribute the following interpretation of "atqaakum": "That is, your deeds done by taqiyyah (dissimulation) (Al-I'tiqadat)

So as you can see, the Shi'ites believe that they should deceive us with their lies, as the Shi'ites hate us, sunni muslims, by calling us worse than dogs....("Although Allah, the Exalted, has not created a creature worse than a dog, yet a Nasbi (ie. A Sunni) is worse than even a dog." here is the Shi'ite book that this lie came from (Haqqul Yakeen (Persian) Vol 2, P. 516)

So my dear Muslims now you know just a small part of what the Shi'ites say in their books which insult the meaning of Islam with their superstitious ideas and horrible lies against the Sahabah. (the prophets Companions)

Now I will finish off with this magnificent ayah from the Quran which shows us that Taqayyah (deception, lying etc) is forbidden in Islam.. and the Shi'ites practice this Taqqayah on us Muslims!!! so dear Brothers and Sisters in Islam, Allah states in the Noble Quran: "Surely those who hide from people the clear proofs and guidance, which we clarified in the Book (Qur'an), will be cursed by Allah and all those who curse." (2:159)

And the statement of the Prophet (s.a.w) who said: "Whoever is asked for knowledge and conceals it will have a bridle of fire around his neck on the Day of Judgement." (Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi)

So dear Brothers and Sisters, now Inshallah we can see beyond the Curtain concealing the Shi'ites true beliefs and not just the ones that he wishes to show us.... Inshallah Allah will guide us to the truth and may we all see the Shi'ites for what they are..... Ameen.

Shi'ite Insults Against The Wives Of The Holy Prophet

Dear Brothers and Sisters in Islam, Inshallah by the end of this article you will see that the Shi'ites not only Curse the Sahabah but they also Insult and Curse the wives of our holy Prophet (may peace be upon him and his wives). I know the Shi'ites say they love the family of the Prophet, but in their Ignorance and kufr they insult his wives by spreading their fabricated Shi'ite Hadeeths about them. What you will see Inshallah is some examples of the many Shi'ite Hadeeth and quotes from their schollars regarding the wives of the Prophet (may peace be upon him and his wives). Also, I would like to point out that no Muslim is even allowed to insult the wives of the Prophet as they were the Mothers of the Beleivers as mentioned in the Quran.

Al killini (a big Shi'ite schollar) assumes that The Companions of the prophet (ﷺ) had all turned disbeleivers after his death except three. He wrote "All the people rejected Islam after the death of the Prophet except three. I said "And who are these?" He said, "Al Miqdad ibn Awsad, Abu Dharr Al Ghifari and Salman the Persian. Heavenly mercy be on them all." (Osul Al Kafi; p: 655.) By this Shi'ite statement, we can see that the Shi'ites say that All of the Sahabah apostated except three! By this, not only are they insulting the Sahabah but they are also insulting the wives of the Prophet (ﷺ) since they were Sahabiat.

In the Shi'ite book called "Al safi Interpretation," it talks about what will happen when the so-called twelveth Imam will come, here is an example of what it contains... "When Our Kaim (12 Imam) gets up, Al Humiraa (i.e. Umm Al Momineen, Aishah (rd) will be raised from the dead so as to be whipped her due punishment, and so as to avenge the daugter of Muhammad (s.a.w): Fatimah (rd)" (Al Safi Interpretaiton; vol 2, P:108) as you can see the Shi'ites trully are evil in their ways... Don't they know that insulting Aisha (rd) takes them outside Islam! (I will explain this later)

The same lie about Aisha (rd) is recorded in another Shi'ite book called: Haqul Yagheen (The Acertained Truth) "When our kaim (12 Imam) Shall come back, he will bring Aisha (rd) to life so as to torment her to avenge Fatimah (rd)" (Haqul Yagheen (The acetained Truth). In persian: p 139.) As you can see the Shi'ites harbor such a great hatred for the Prophet's (ﷺ) wives, the ones who are praised in Hadeeth and Qur'an.

Now as you can see the Shi'ites have wholly different religion compared to Islam, how can we as Muslims say that the ones who insult the prophets (ﷺ) wives are Muslims?? It does not make sense! Now if we said that the ones who insulted the wives of the Prophet (ﷺ) were Munafiqs (hypocrites) and Kafar's (disbeleivers) then I could understand your point.

Now my Brothers and Sisters in Islam, do you know the verdict for someone who insults the Prophet's (ﷺ) wives? I dont think so.. otherwise there would be a massive push to fight the Shi'ites lies about Islam! So let me show you Inshallah

Abu Sa'eed al-Khudri (may Allah be pleased with him) said: "The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w) said: 'Do not slander my Companions, for if one of you were to spend an amount of gold equivalent to the size of Mount Uhud, you would not even come halfway up to their level.'" (Reported by al-Bukhaari, al-Fath, no. 3379). So by slandering the Companions (Sahabah) you would be committing Kufr! for Allah says

in the Quran:

Say (O' Muhammed -s.a.w-): "Obey Allah and the Messenger, But if they turn away, then Allah does not Like the disbelievers." So by slandering the Companions, you are not obeying the Prophet (ﷺ) which is disobeying Allah! Can't those Shi'ites see the truth which is in front of their faces?

Imaam Ibn Hazm quoted a report with an isnad going back to Hishaam ibn 'Ammar, who said: "I heard Maalik ibn Anas say: 'Whoever curses Abu Bakr should be whipped, and whoever curses 'Aa'ishah should be killed.' He was asked, 'Why do you say that concerning (the one who curses) 'Aa'ishah?' He said, 'Because Allaah says concerning 'Aa'ishah, may Allah be pleased with her (interpretation of the meaning): **"Allaah forbids you from it [slander] and warns you not to repeat the like of it forever, if you are believers."** (al-Noor 24:17)"

Abu Bakr ibn al-'Arabi said: "Because the people who slandered 'Aa'ishah accused a pure and innocent person of immorality, then Allah exonerated her. So everyone who accuses her of that of which Allah has stated she is innocent is rejecting what Allah says, and everyone who rejects what Allah says is a kaafir. This is the opinion of Maalik, and the matter is very clear to those who have insight."

And let me finish off with this Hadeeth inshallah:

The Prophet said: "The best of my nation is my generation, then those who follow them ,and then those who follow them." [Sahih Bukhari](#)

So how can we Insult someone who were more pious and who loved the Prophet (ﷺ) more than any other generation. All I say to the Shi'ites is Fear Allah and stop these insulting Lies about the Wives of the Prophet (s.a.w)

May Allah Guide the Shi'ites to the True Islam, and May Allah show us what the Shi'ites really are, Ameen.

See Also: [[Answering Shi'ism -- Shia curses Aisha, the mother of the Believers \(May Allah be pleased with her\)](#)]

The Islamic Ruling On Shi`ites (Rawafid)

[Allah] [Muhammad] [Ahl-ul-Bayt] [Early Scholars] [Contemporary Scholars]

Prophet Muhammad ﷺ

Ibrahim reported that his father Hasan said that his father Hasan said that his father Ali bin Abu-Talib (may Allah be pleased with them) said: "The Messenge of Allah said: **There will appear, at the end of time, people who are called Rawafidah (rejecters). They will reject Islam.**" [Musnad Ahmad]

Abdullah ibn Abbaas (may Allah be pleased with them) reported that The Messenger (may peace be upon him) said: "**There will be, at the end of the time, people who are called Rawafid (rejecters). They will reject Islam and spit it out. Thus, KILL THEM for they are polytheist.**"

Ahl-UI-Bayt (The Household Of The Messenger)

I Maam Ali (r.a.)

It was reported that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) used to repeat the following statement: "The best one after the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) is Abu Bakr. And the best one after Abu Bakr is Umar." He also whipped those who claimed that he is better than Abu Bakr and Umar. [I bn Majah]

Imaam Ali bin Abu-Talib (r.a.) said: "The Messenger of Allah called me and told me: '**You are alike with Jesus, Jews hated him till they slandered his mother, and Christians loved him till they put him in the position that is not for him.**' With regard to me, two categories of people will be ruined, namely he who loves me too much and the love takes him away from rightfulness, and he who hates me too much and the hatred takes him away from rightfulness. Verily, I am not a prophet, and there is nothing revealed to me. But I work with the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of his Prophet (ﷺ) as much as I can. So whatever I have asked you in regard of obeying Allah, it is your duty to obey me whether you like it or not." [Ahmad]

Imaam Ali (r.a.) said: "There will appear, at the end of time, people claimed to be from our Shia but they are not from our Shia. They have a nickname called Rawafid (rejecters). If you meet them then **KILL THEM** for they are polytheist."

Imaam Ali (r.a.) said: "With regard to me, two categories of people will be ruined, namely he who loves me too much and the love takes him away from rightfulness, and he who hates me too much and the hatred takes him away from rightfulness. The best man with regard to me is he who is on the middle course. So be with him and be with the great majority (of Muslims) because Allah's hand (of protection) is on keeping unity." [Nahjul Balagha, sermon 126 about the Kharijites]

In the that time, people who called them selves Muslims were three groups :

- 1- Kharijites who said that Imam Ali was a disbeliever and they send Ibn Muljim to kill him and he did that.
- 2- Shia who said that he was infalleble Imam and Allah had chosen him for leading Muslims.
- 3- Sunnies (Majority of Muslims) who said that he was a great companion of the prophet and he was a great leader to Muslims but Muslims had chosen him to be thier leader not Allah.

Who are the people of the middle course & the great majority (of Muslims) as Imam Ali said in his sermon, Read Imam Ali's words and then look to the three groups and you will find the answer!

I Imaam Hasan bin Ali (r.a.)

'Aasim bin Damrah said to Hasan bin Ali that the Shi`ites claim that Ali will come back. Then Imaam Hasan said: "**Those liars lied. If we had known that, his wives would not have married (other men) nor would we have shared his heritage.**"

Early Scholars

I Imaam Abu Hanifah

It was reported that often Abu Haneefah used to repeat the following statement about the Shi`ites, "**Whoever doubts whether they are disbelievers has himself committed disbelief.**"

I Imaam al-Shaafi`e

On one occasion al-Shaafi`i said concerning the Shi`ites, "I have not seen among the **heretics** a people more famous for falsehood than the Raafidite Shi`ites." [Ibn Taymeeyah, Minhaaj as-Sunnah an-Nabawiyah, 1/39] On another occasion he said, "Narrate knowledge from everyone you meet except the Raafidite Shi`ites, because they invent Hadeeths and adopt them as part of their religion." [Ibid, p. 38]

I Imaam Maalik

Once Maalik was asked about them and he replied, "Do not speak to them nor narrate from them, for surely they are **liars.**" [Minhaaj as-Sunnah, 1/37] During a class of Imaam Maalik, it was mentioned that the Raafidite Shi`ites curse the Sahaabah. In reply, he quoted the Quranic verse, "**Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves. So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them.**" He then said, "Whoever becomes enraged when the Sahaabah are mentioned is one about whom the verse speaks." [Tafseer al-Qurtubee, Soorah al-Fath; Editor's note: That is, anyone who is enraged by the mention of the Sahaabah is a disbeliever, because the verse says, "...the disbelievers may become enraged with them (Sahaabah)."]

Imaam Ibn Hazm quoted a report with an isnad going back to Hishaam ibn 'Ammar, who said: "I heard Maalik ibn Anas say: "**Whoever curses Abu Bakr should be whipped, and whoever curses 'Aa'ishah should be killed.**" He was asked, "Why do you say that concerning (the one who curses) 'Aa'ishah?" He said, **Because Allah says concerning 'Aa'ishah, (may Allah be pleased with her): "Allah forbids you from it (slander her) and warns you not to repeat the like of it forever, if you are believers."** (al-Noor 24:17)"

I Abu Bakr ibn al-'Arabi

Abu Bakr ibn al-'Arabi said: "Because the people who slandered 'Aa'ishah accused a pure and innocent person of immorality, then Allah exonerated her. So everyone who accuses her of that of which Allah has stated she is innocent is rejecting what Allah says, and everyone who **rejects** what Allah says is a **kaafir**. This is the opinion of Maalik, and the matter is very clear to those who have insight."

I Ibn al-Mubaarak

Ibn al-Mubaarak was reported to have said, "Religion is gained from Ahl al-Hadeeth, scholastic theology and crafty exemptions from religious ordinances of Ahl ar-Ray and lies from the Raafidite Shi'ites." [Adh-Dhahabee, al Muntaqaa min Minhaaj al-I`tidaal, p. 480]

I Abu Zur`ah ar-Raazee

This great scholar was quoted as saying, "If you see someone degrade any of the companions of the Prophet, (ﷺ), know that he is a disbeliever. Because the Prophet, (ﷺ), was real, what he brought was the truth and all of it was conveyed to us by the way of the Sahaabah. What those disbelievers wish to do is to cast doubt on the reliability of our narrators in order to invalidate the Quraan and the Sunnah. Thus the disbelievers are the ones most deserving defamation."

I Ibn Hazm al-Andaloosee

One day during the period of Muslim rule in Spain, Imaam Abu Muhammad ibn Hazm was having a debate with some Spanish Catholic priests about their religious texts. He brought before them evidence of textual distortions in the Bible and the loss of original manuscripts. When they replied by pointing out to him Shi'ite claims also being distorted, Ibn Hazm informed them that "Shi'ite could not be used as evidence against the Quraan or against Muslims because they are **not** themselves Muslims." [Ibn Hazm, al-Fisaal fee al-Milal wa an-Nihal, 2/78 and 4/182]

Their claims have been rebutted by numerous other early scholars like [Ibn Taymeeyah](#) in [Minhaaj as-Sunnah](#), [adh-Dhahabee](#) in [Muntaqaa min Minhaaj al-I`tidaal](#), [Ibn Katheer](#) in his history book [al-Bidaayah wa an-Nihaayah](#), [Ibn al-Jawzee](#) in [Talbees Iblees](#), [al-Qaadee ibn al`Arabee](#) in [al`Awwaasim min al-Qawaasim](#), [At-Tahaawee](#) in [al`Aqeedah at-Tahaawiyah](#), and [Al-Qaadee Abu Ya`laa](#).

Contemporary Scholars

I Abul-A'laa al-Maududi

This great Pakistani scholar and leader wrote an introduction to the book, [Ar-Riddah bain al-Ams wa al-Yaum](#) (lit. [Apostacy in the Past and the Present](#)) by Muhammad KaadHim Habeeb published in 1977. In it the author wrote of the Imaami Ja'fari Shi'ites, "In spite of their moderate views (relative to other sects of Shi'ism), they are swimming in disbelief like white blood cells in blood or like fish in water." Maududi supported these views by praising the author and recommending that the book be done in hardback.

I Imaam al-Aloosee

He declared the Raafidite Shi'ites disbelievers because of their defamation of the Sahaabah. His position was based on the rulings of Imam Malik and other scholars who were in agreement with him. In reply to their claim to be Ahl Bayt (the Prophet's (ﷺ) family), al-Aloosee said, "**No, they are really followers of the Devils and Ahl Bayt are innocent of them.**"

I Bahjat al-Baitaar

When this great Syrian scholar was asked if transactions were permissible with Shi'ites, he replied in

a book called [Al-islam wa as-Sahaabah al-Kiraam bain as-Sunnah wa ash-Shee'ah](#) in which he said, "Political and economic dealings with them are allowed in the same way that they are allowed with states and people with whom there are treaties in spite of differences between their lands and religions and ours. And help can only be sought from Allah."

I **Muhammad Rasheed Ridaa**

This scholar was among those who worked sincerely for rapprochement between the Sunnites and the Shi'ites, and they in turn pretended moderation for his benefit. However, in the midst of his efforts they caught him by surprise by presenting him with some of their books which slandered islam. He then replied to them in a paper called [As-Sunnah wa ash-Shee'ah](#) in which he exposed their doctrines and idolatrous practices.

I **Dr. Hilaalee**

After living closely to the Shi'ites for some years, the famous Morrocan scholar, Dr Hilaalee, wrote a paper on them in which he declared them disbelievers.

I **Al-Basheer al-Ibraaheemee**

While visiting Iraq, this professor who is the leading religious scholar in Algeria saw with his own eyes the Shi'ite book, [Az-Zahraa](#), in which 'Umar ibn al-Khataab - [may Allah be pleased with him](#) - is accused of homosexuality. On his return home to Algeria he exposed the Shi'ites and clearly outlined their principle beliefs and practices.

I **Mustafaa as-Sibaa'ee**

This Syrian scholar was also among those who lived with the Shi'ites for a period and worked for rapprochement with them; however, he soon discovered their real intentions and noted them in the foreword of his classic, [As-Sunnah wa Makaanatuhaa](#). He wrote, "Those people continue to hold fast to their books in which slanderous attacks and false descriptions are given of the incidents of disagreement among the Sahaabah. Hence their intention behing the call to rapprochement seems to be bringing the Sunnites closer to the Shi'ite creed and **not** bringing them closer to each other." On another occasion, he wrote, "A Muslim would almost be in a state of total bewilderment and confusion at the audacity of these people towards Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) were it not for his knowledge that **most of the Raafidites are Persians**. Some **Persians** feigned islam and **used Shi'ism as a cover for the destruction of islam**. There were also among the Persians those who were unable to free themselves from the effects of their former religions and thus they entered islam with a pagan mentality which did not mind telling lies about the Prophet (ﷺ)"

Among other contemporary scholars who have have made similar statements are: **Shaikh Ibn Baaz**, **'Allaamah ash-Shanqeetee**, **al-Albaanee**, **Ahmad Ameen**, **Muhibbuddeen al-Khateeb**, **an-Nashaasheeb** and **Dr. Rashaad Saalim**.

The History Of The Shia

The religion of the Shiah was founded by a Jew from Yemen called Abdullah bin Saba'. This religion has started with the assassination of the rightly guided Khalifa Uthman and branched into many sections.

Uthman ruled for twelve years. The first six years were marked by internal peace and tranquility, but during the second half of his caliphate a rebellion arose. The Jews and the Magians, taking advantage of dissatisfaction among the people, began conspiring against Uthman, and by publicly airing their complaints and grievances, gained so much sympathy that it became difficult to distinguish friend from foe.

It may seem surprising that a ruler of such vast territories, whose armies were matchless, was unable to deal with these rebels. If Uthman had wished, the rebellion could have been crushed at the very moment it began. But he was reluctant to be the first to shed the blood of Muslims (especially Sahaba), however rebellious they might be. No one would ever expect what happened later. He preferred to reason with them, to persuade them with kindness and generosity. He well remembered hearing the Prophet ﷺ say, "Once the sword is unsheathed among my followers, it will not be sheathed until the Last Day."

The rebels demanded that he abdicate and some of the Companions advised him to do so. He would gladly have followed this course of action, but again he was bound by a solemn pledge he had given to the Prophet. "Perhaps God will clothe you with a shirt, Uthman" the Prophet had told him once, "and if the people want you to take it off, do not take it off for them." Uthman said to a well-wisher on a day when his house was surrounded by the rebels, "God's Messenger made a covenant with me and I shall show endurance in adhering to it."

After a long siege, the rebels broke into Uthman's house and murdered him. When the first assassin's sword struck Uthman, he was reciting the verse: "Verily, God sufficeth thee; He is the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing" [2:137]

Ali accepted the caliphate very reluctantly. Uthman's murder and the events surrounding it were a symptom, and also became a cause, of civil strife on a large scale. All governors gave the pledge to Ali except Muawiya, the governor of [Sham](#) (Great Syria). Muawiya declined to obey until Uthman's blood was avenged. His decision was based on the fact that he is not required to obey the Caliph until he (Ali) is able to enforce the rule of Allah. Muawiya was the cousin of 'Uthman, so he was the responsible of asking Ali to bring the murderers to trial. The Prophet's widow Aisha also took the position that Ali should first bring the murderers to trial. Due to the chaotic conditions during the last days of Uthman it was very difficult to establish the identity of the murderers, and Ali refused to punish anyone whose guilt was not lawfully proved.

The pretext for the meeting of the armies on the day of the Camel and the day of Siffin was the demand for 'Uthman's killers on the part of 'A'isha and Mu'awiya, but the winds of war were fanned by the followers of Abdullah bin Saba' the Jew, from inside all three camps until events escaped the control of the Companions. It is related that 'Ali, 'A'isha, and Mu'awiya often expressed astonishment at the dissension and opposition that surrounded them.

After that some Shia declared Ali as a god. He then burned them alive with fire. After the killing of Abdullah bin Saba', Shia were divided into many new sects. Each one has its own Imam.

The Seveners or Isma'ilis, like all Shiites, believe that the descendants of Muhammad, through his daughter Fatima and her husband Ali the fourth Caliph, are the rightful rulers of the Muslim world. Thus the descendants of Ali are considered infallible and as divinely guided as Muhammad himself. This sect derives its name from Isma'il, the eldest son of the sixth Imam, Jafar as-Sadiq. In 762 CE, Isma'il died before his father, which resulted in bitter disputes of succession. The minority of Shiites regarded the old line of Imams extinct and chose Isma'il's eldest son as the new Imam. Thus they

proclaimed a cycle of seven Imams, Ali being the first and Isma'il the seventh, and thus the seventh Imam after his line of Imams would be the Mahdi, or Messiah, or the seventh after him, etc..

The Isma'ilis have usually been small in numbers, but well organised and disciplined. Soon they developed into a cult, borrowing various ideas from Jewish mysticism, Greek philosophy, Babylonian astrology, Christian Gnosticism, etc.., When secular sciences were being employed in the Abbasid Empire, the Isma'ilis were thriving, and managed to recruit a large number of followers, who formed a well organised guerrilla army. By combining their scholarly skills and extraordinary underground network of spies, the Isma'ilis established their anti-Caliph in Egypt during the 10th century. They named his dynasty after Muhammad's daughter, and thus the name Fatimids emerged. In reality they are the dynasty of a Jew called Abdullah bin Qaddah, and that was they were called Abidi too. The Abidi State in Egypt quickly expanded and soon the Isma'ilis controlled western Syria and a large part of North Africa, killing thousands of Muslims. They also built a new capital, Fustat, near the ancient Pyramids, which in a few centuries grew to be the largest city in the Muslim world, under the name of Cairo.

When the Abidi dynasty was destroyed by the Abbasids, the Isma'ilis split into two sub-sects, Tayibiya and Niziriya, named after two Abidi princes. The former sect was soon transformed into a esoteric cult, which moved its activities underground and became invisible. The Niziriya sect transformed itself back into the pre-Abidi Isma'ilism, developing a network of agents and spies all over the Muslim world. The best known organization within the Niziriya was probably the drug-abusing Assassin sect, notorious for assassinations all over the Muslim world. Today, however, the Niziriya sect has turned pacifist and increasingly Westernized.

Out of the Assassin stronghold in Syria, two heterodox sub-sects have survived, the Alawite and the Druze. The Alawite sect is militant and combines radical theories from both Isma'il and Ithna Shia. The Druzes, on the other hand, have until more recently been more pacifistic, waiting for the return of their Mahdi, the psychotic Abidi Caliph al-Hakim, who 'disappeared' when he burned down his capital around 1000 CE. In the 13th century the Druzes closed their sect, and became a distinct tribe or nation. They serve today in the Israeli army against Palestinian Muslims.

The largest sect within Shia is the Ithna or Twelver, which follows the original line of Imams. When the Seveners chose the son of Isma'il to become the Imam, the majority of Shiites chose Isma'il's younger brother, Muza al-Kazim, as the seventh Imam. The Ithna adopt their 'Twelver' name from their belief in the twelfth Imam, Muhammad ibn al-Askari, who 'disappeared' one day and thus became the hidden Mahdi who would return to earth at the end of days. The 'Twelvers' worship their Imams, sometimes as the incarnation of Ali or Hussain. They form the vast majority of Shiites, including most Iranians and almost 50% of the Iraqi nation.

The third largest body in Shia is the Zaydi sect or the Fivers, prevailing in Yemen and among some Bedouin tribes in Saudi-Arabia. The Zaydi sect is more or less the deification of the 7th century Arabian culture, and it fiercely denounces the semi-divinity of Imams, contrary to the Twelver. Their founder was the fifth Imam, Zayd ibn Abidin, who was a rationalist and thus denounced his alleged divinity. The Zaydi Imams are more like Bedouin sheikhs than divine authorities, and thus reject hereditary leadership, and are only visible during warfare.

There are said to be more than 70 small Shia sects all around the world. Probably the best example of these was the Bahai sect, which has been persecuted and refuted as anti-Islamic, but grows fast as a separate religion, basing its doctrines on 'world peace and harmony' and the unity of all religions. The center of the Bahai sect is in Israel!

Sunnis Vs. Shi'ites

An Outline Of The Differences Between The Sunnis And The Shi'ite In Matters Of Faith And Doctrine

1. [The Glorious Qur'an](#)
2. [Ahaadeeth \(The Prophetic Traditions\)](#)
3. [The Companions of the Prophet](#)
4. [Belief in the oneness of Allah](#)
5. [Seeing Allah](#)
6. [The Unseen](#)
7. [Aalur-Rasool](#) (the family of the Messenger - may Allah be pleased with them all)
8. [The meaning of Shari'ah and Haqeeqah](#)
9. [Islamic jurisprudence](#)
10. [Al-walaa'](#) (obedience and devotion)
11. [Taqiyyah](#) (calculated deception)
12. [Governing the Islamic state](#)
13. [Editors note:](#)

The Glorious Qur'an

Sunnis

There is unanimous agreement among them regarding its authenticity, and its text being safeguarded from any additions or deletions. The Qur'an is to be understood in consonance with the rules and bases of the Arabic language. They believe in every single letter of it, it being the word of Allah the Exalted. The Qur'an is neither temporal nor

Shi'ites

To some of them, the Qur'an's authenticity is doubtful, and if it appears to contradict any of their sectarian beliefs or doctrines, then they give the Qur'anic text strange, far-fetched interpretations that agree with their sectarian views. For that reason they are called Al-Mutawwilah (those who give their own interpretations to the revealed texts). They love to

newly created, but is eternal. Falsehood does not approach it from before it or behind it. It is the primary source of all the Muslims' tenets of faith, their rites and rules of conduct.

draw attention to the discord that occurred at the time when the Qur'an was first compiled. The views and opinions of their Imams are the primary source of their jurisprudence.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Hadeeths (The Prophetic Traditions)

Sunnis

For the Sunnis, it is the second source of revealed law, complementary to the Noble Quran. It is not permissible to contradict or reject the rulings and directives contained in those Hadeeths (ahaadeeth) which are reliably attributed to the Prophet (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him). The methodology applied in determining the authenticity of these traditions utilizes a set of stringent rules agreed upon by the scholars who specialize in this field, and involves detailed analysis of the chain of transmitters of any given tradition. No distinction is made between male and female narrators; judgment is made solely on the basis of individual trustworthiness and technical ability in relating traditions, and every narrator's history is recorded. No tradition is accepted from a known liar, or from one whose morals or scholarly ability were not corroborated, or from anyone, merely on the basis of his family connection or lineage. The compilation of the Prophetic Traditions is taken to be a sacred Trust, the fulfillment of which overrides all other considerations.

Shi'ites

The Shi'ites reject all Prophetic Traditions which were not related by members of Ahlul-Bait, or their descendants. The only exception to this rule is their acceptance of a few Hadeeths (ahaadeeth) narrated by those who sided with 'Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) in his political wars. They do not attend to the authenticity and soundness of the chain of narrators, nor do they approach the study of the Prophetic Traditions with a scientific, critical attitude. Their narrations often appear in a form like that of the following example: "It has been reported regarding Muhammad bin Isma'eel by way of some of our friends through a man who transmitted it from him ['Ali] that he said..." Their books are filled with hundreds of thousands of traditions whose authenticity cannot be confirmed. They have built their religion specifically upon these spurious texts while outright rejecting over three quarters of the authentic Prophetic Traditions. This is one of the main differences between the Shi'ites and the Sunnis.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

The Companions Of The Prophet

Sunnis

It is unanimously agreed that the noble Companions deserve our utmost respect, and are absolutely trustworthy. As for the discord which occurred among them, it is to be considered as the consequence of the sincere exercise of personal conviction and opinion. The discord was resolved and is a thing of the past. It is not permissible for us to hold, on the basis of past differences among the Companions, grudges and ill will which continue for generations. The

Shi'ites

They charge that all save a few of the Companions had turned apostate after the death of the Prophet (may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). On the other hand, they grant the Companion 'Ali bin Abi Taalib a very special status; some of them consider him vicegerent, and some view him as a prophet, while others take him for a god! Shi'ites pass judgment on Muslims in accordance with their position with regards to 'Ali. Whoever was elected caliph before 'Ali is held by them to be a tyrant, an apostate or a sinner. The same judgment is passed on every Muslim ruler who did not step down for any of the descendants of 'Ali and

Companions are those whom Allah has described in the best of terms; He has praised them upon many occasions. It is not lawful for anyone to make any accusation against them or cast suspicion upon them, and there is no benefit to be derived therefrom.

his wife Fatimah (may Allah be pleased with them). The Shi'ites have thus created an atmosphere of animosity throughout the history of Islam, and the question of partisanship of Ahlul-Bait developed into a school of thought which preached and perpetuated such detrimental teachings down through the generations.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Belief In The Oneness Of Allah

Sunnis

Sunnis believe that Allah is the One, the Only, God, the Almighty Subduer. He has no partners or rivals, and He has no equal. There is no intermediary between Him and His worshippers. They believe in His attributes as they were revealed in the Qur'anic verses, and they do not obscure their obvious meanings with far-fetched interpretations. They do not strike any comparison between the divine attributes and other things, for as Allah says in His Book "There is nothing like unto Him." They believe that Allah sent the Prophets and commissioned them with conveying to mankind His Message and Guidance. They conveyed Allah's Message and did not conceal any part of it. They believe that knowledge of the unseen belongs to Allah alone. Intercession is confined to the Hereafter, and none may intercede except by Allah's permission. All supplication, vows, offerings of sacrifices and requests for needs are to be directed to God alone; they are not to be directed to any other besides Him. Allah alone controls good and evil. There is no one, living or dead in His authority or in His administration of affairs. All beings depend on Him, and need His favor and mercy. The knowledge of Allah is attained through knowledge of divinely revealed law, and this has precedence over the exercise of reason, which might never guide one to the truth, although it may provide reassurance to the believer, and help him to achieve tranquillity.

Shi'ites

The Shi'ites also believe in Allah the Exalted and His Oneness, except that they adulterate this belief with polytheistic rituals and observances. They implore and make supplication to Allah's slaves and worshippers rather than to Him alone, saying "O Ali!" and "O Husain!" and "O Zainab!" Similarly they make vows and sacrifice beasts in the name of others besides Allah. They request the dead to fulfil their needs as is shown by their prayers and poems. They consider their Imams to be infallible, to have knowledge of the unseen, and to partake in the administration of the universe. It is the Shi'ites who invented Sufism (mysticism) to consecrate their deviated tenets and thus give them the air of legitimacy. They claimed that there is special power and authority invested in the "awliyyaa" (mystic saints), "aqaab" (those considered to be the spiritual axes of the universe, which turns due to their exalted status), and Ahlul-Bait Shi'ite scholars and clergy impressed upon their followers the concept of a hereditary privileged class, as a matter of religion, although this has no foundation in Islam at all. Knowledge of Allah, is attained, according to them, through the exercise of reason, not by knowledge of divinely revealed law. That which came to us by way of revelation in the Qur'an merely represents an affirmation of reason's judgment; it is not considered to be a source which is independent of, and beyond the limits of reason.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Seeing Allah

Sunnis

Sunnis believe that believers will be blessed with the sight of Allah in the

Shi'ites

The Shi'ites believe that to

Hereafter, as is mentioned in the Qur'an: "On that Day faces [of the believers] will be resplendent, looking towards their Lord."

see Allah is not possible in this world nor in the Hereafter.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

The Unseen

Sunnis

Allah the Exalted has reserved knowledge of the unseen for Himself; however, He has revealed to His Prophets some of the affairs and conditions of the unseen, for particular reasons. The Qur'an says: "And they do not encompass anything of God's knowledge except what He will to reveal thereof"

Shi'ites

They claim that knowledge of the unseen belongs solely to their Imams, and it is not for the Prophet to inform us about the unseen. Some Shi'ites have gone so far as to claim godhead for those Imams.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Aalur-Rasool (The Family Of The Messenger) (May Allah Be Pleased With Them All)

Sunnis

Aalur-Rasool, according to the Sunnis, has various meanings. The best single definition of this term is "the followers of the Prophet Muhammad in the faith of Islam." It is also defined as "the pious and God-fearing people of the Prophet's ummah (nation of believers)." It is also said that the term refers to the believing relatives of Muhammad, from the tribes of Haashim and 'Abdul-Muttalib.

Shi'ites

According to the Shi'ites the term Aalur-Rasool refers only to 'Ali bin Abi Taalib, to some of his sons, and to the descendants 'of those sons.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

The Meaning Of Shari'ah (Islamic Law) And Haqeeqah (The Truth)

Sunnis

In the Sunnis' view, the shariah (the divinely revealed law) is itself the haqeeqah (the essential knowledge, the reality). They hold that Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah, did not conceal from his nation of believers any part of that knowledge, contained in the revealed law. There was no good thing that he did not guide us to, and no evil thing that he did not warn us about. Allah has said 'On this day I have completed your religion. Therefore, ' the sources of the Islamic faith are Allah's Book and the sunnah (practice) of the Prophet, and there is no need to add anything to that. The relationship of the believer with

Shi'ites

The Shi'ites see the shari'ah as being merely the various rulings and directives set forth by the Prophet; they concern the common and superficial folk only. As for the haqeeqah, no one knows it except the Imams of AhlulBait These Imams acquire the sciences of haqeeqah through inheritance, one generation after another. It remains a secret possession among them. Furthermore, the Shi'ites consider their Imams infallible; their every work and practice is deemed incumbent upon their followers. They believe that one may communicate with God

Allah, and the path to the achievement of 800d works and worship, are clear and direct. The only one to know the actual condition of the believers is Allah, so (i.e do not pass judgment on the praiseworthiness or purity of anyone, lest we overstep our bounds). The views and opinions of anyone may be accepted or rejected, except or those of the infallible Prophet of Allah, upon whom be Allah's blessings and peace.

only through intermediaries, and it is for this reason that their religious leaders have such an inflated opinion of themselves, as evidenced by the exaggerated titles they take for themselves, e.g. Baabullah (the door to Allah), Waliyullah (the friend of Allah), Hujjatullah (Allah's proof), Ayatullah (the sign of Allah), Al-Ma'soom (the infallible one), etc.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Islamic Jurisprudence

Sunnis

Ahlus-sunnah adhere strictly to the legal rulings and directives of the Noble Qur'an, as clarified by the sayings and practices of the Messenger We also depend upon the sayings of the Companions and the generation of trustworthy scholars who followed them. They were the nearest to the Prophet's era and the most sincere in supporting his mission, throughout the tests and trials which had to be endured in the course of establishing Islam. Since this religion has been completed, no one has the right to formulate new legislation or directives; however, in order to properly understand the details of the revealed law, and to apply it according to new situations and circumstances while keeping in mind the general welfare of the people, one must refer to the qualified Muslim scholars who must work solely within the bounds established by Allah's Book and the sunnah of the Prophet (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him).

Shi'ites

They depend only on the exclusive sources which they claim for their Imams: upon their farfetched interpretations of the Quran; and upon their contrary attitude which puts them at odds with the majority of the Muslim peoples. The Shi'ites consider their Imams to be infallible, and to have the right to create new rulings and directives .in contradiction to the revealed law. For example, they have altered:

- (a) The call to prayer and the prescribed times and postures of prayers.
- (b) The rites of Hajj (pilgrimage) and visitation to the sacred places.
- (c) The specified times for beginning and breaking the fast.
- (d) The rulings with regards to zakaah (alms-tax) and its distribution.
- (e) The inheritance laws. The Shi'ites are very particular to take positions in opposition to Ahlus-Sunnah, thus widening the gap between Sunnis and Shi'ites.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Al-Walaa' (Obedience And Devotion)

Sunnis

Al-walaa ' means "total adherence, obedience and devotion." The Sunnis believe that it is due only to the Messenger of Allah, for Allah says in His Book "Whosoever obeys the Messenger, he has verily obeyed Allah." No other person deserves our strict adherence or our obedience and devotion. Our responsibilities to others are defined by known legal principles, and there is no obedience due to any human being if that entails disobedience to the Creator.

Shi'ites

They view al-walaa' as being one of the pillars of iman. They define it as the firm belief in the Twelve Imams including the "hidden" Imam). They consider one who does not have strict devotion to Aalul-Bait as one who has no faith. They will not pray behind such a person, nor will they give him zakaah although he be deserving of it. Such a person would be treated as a kaafir by them.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Taqiyyah (Calculated Deception)

Sunnis

It is defined as presenting an outer appearance that belies what one conceals inside, to protect oneself from harm. It is considered impermissible for a Muslim to deceive other Muslims, because of the Prophet's saying: Whoever deceives is not of us." Resorting to taqiyyah is permitted only in one situation: during war against the disbelievers who are the enemies of Islam. That is part of the etiquette of war. It is incumbent on the Muslim to be truthful and courageous in upholding the truth, and to be neither ostentatious, nor deceiving, nor treacherous. He should give sincere counsel, enjoin what is good and forbid what is evil.

Shi'ites

In spite of the differences among the various Shi'ite sects, they all agree that taqiyyah is a prescribed duty and a pillar of their faith. Their schools of thought could not stand without it. They learn its principles and methods and they practice it, especially if they are in dire circumstances. They exaggeratedly praise and flatter those whom they consider disbelievers, whom they consider deserving of slaughter and destruction. The verdict of kufr is passed on anyone who is not of their sectarian school, and for them "the end justifies the means." Their ethics allow every manner of lying, cunning and deception.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Governing The Islamic State

Sunnis

The state is ruled by a Caliph (Khalifa) elected to his position of leadership from among the Muslim people. To be leader, a man must be sane, rightly guided and knowledgeable. He should be known for his piety and trustworthiness, and he should be capable of bearing such a responsibility. The caliph is nominated to his position Of leadership by those Muslims endowed with knowledge and experience. If he does not hold firm to his duty, and deviates from the directives of the Qur'an, then they may remove him from his position and

Shi'ites

Generally speaking, the right to govern according to Shi'ites, is hereditary, and restricted to 'Ali, and his descendants by Fatimah (the daughter of the Prophet). There is, however, some slight difference among them on the point of the hereditary right as to whom it belongs to. Due to this view of theirs, the Shi'ites are never loyal to any ruler unless he is one of the descendants of 'Ali bin Abi Taalib. When the practice of hereditary leadership vested in the descendants of 'Ali and Fatimah could no longer be maintained, because the line had come to an end, the Shi'ites invented the doctrine of Ar-Raj'ah, according to which the last Imam was not dead, but

strip him of all authority. Otherwise, he deserves the obedience and cooperation of every Muslim. The role of caliphate is, to the Sunnis, a great burden and responsibility, not a mere honor or opportunity for exploitations.

"hidden". He is expected to arise and return at the end of time, when he will slaughter all of his political opponents, and those of his ancestors, and will restore to the Shi'ites their rights which were "plundered" by the other sects over the centuries.

[\[Back to Top\]](#)

Editors note: With reference to the use of the terms "Sunni and Shi'ite" Muslims prefer to simply be called "Muslim". One is either Muslim or not. There is no such thing as a Shi'ite Muslim. The Term Sunni is used here to denote those who Practice Islam according to Authentic Traditional Islamic sources, not to indicate that Shi'ite and Sunni's are both Muslims. Shi'ism is a separate religion and should be regarded as such.

An Exposition And Refutation Of The Sources Of Shi'ism

Table Of Contents

- 1 Publisher's Note [1](#)
- 2 Introduction [2](#)
- 3 The Predetermined Fact Of Sectarianism [3](#)
- 4 The Call To Reconciliation Of The Various Sects And Schools Of Thought [6](#)
- 5 Islamic Jurisprudence [9](#)
- 6 The Question Of Taqiyyah [10](#)
- 7 Shi'ite Attack On The Noble Qur'an [10](#)
 - (So-Called Suratul-Wilaayah) [12](#)
 - [Fatwa Against Companions] [12](#)
- 8 Shi'ite Lies, Even Against `Ali [15](#)
- 9 Rejoicing Of The Missionaries And Orientalists [15](#)
- 10 Shi'ite Views On The Muslim Rulers [18](#)
- 11 Malice Against Abu Bakr And `Umar [18](#)
- 12 Shi'ites Exalt The Assassin Of The Caliph `Umar [20](#)
- 13 Desire For Revenge And Destruction [21](#)
- 14 Shi'ites' Way Of Thinking Unchanged [24](#)
- 15 Distortion Of Historical Facts [26](#)
- 16 The Shi'ites Place Their Imams Above The Messenger [27](#)
- 17 Shi'ite Treachery Towards Islamic Governments [29](#)
- 18 The Treachery Of Al-'Alqami And Ibn Abil-Hadeed [30](#)
- 19 An Impediment To Reconciliation [30](#)
- 20 Salvation Cannot Be Attained Without Pledging Allegiance And Granting Sovereignty To Ahlil-Bait [31](#)

- 21 Shi'ites Differ With Muslims In Fundamentals, Not Only In The Secondary Issues [32](#)
- 22 The Tale Of The Door And The Tunnel [34](#)
- 23 The- Concept Of Pledging Allegiance According To The Muslims [35](#)
- 24 Friendship And Affection Among The Rightly-Guided Caliphs [37](#)
- 25 Why We Must Rid Ourselves Of Any Connection With The Shi'ites [37](#)
- 26 Shi'ites Prefer Propagation Of Their Sectarian Tenets To Taqreeb [39](#)
- 27 The Intrigue Of Baabism And Bahatism And The Ensuing Upheaval In Iran [40](#)
- 28 From Shi'ism To Communism [40](#)

Publisher'S Note

With the advent of Islam in Arabia, the polytheists, Jews and Christians had to retreat as they could not withstand the challenge thrown by Islam to accept the reality of monotheism. These forces particularly the Jews were most vociferous in their opposition to Islam. As they were not in a position to challenge Islam openly, they resorted to strike from within. It was Abdullah bin Saba, a Jew, who pretending to be a Muslim coined and propagated the Divine right of Ali Bin Abi Talib, May Allah be pleased with him, to the Caliphate as the successor to the prophet Muhammad (May Allah be pleased with him), by virtue of his position as the son in law of the Prophet (ﷺ). By and by the idea was turned in to a doctrine and those professing it called themselves as Shi'ites. This doctrine was based upon the contempt and animosity towards the pious caliphs particularly Abu Bakr and Umar (May Allah be pleased with them). Since its very inception this break away group has been playing a negative role in the Muslim World and has brought untold miseries to the Ummah. The annals, of the Islamic history bear testimony to the above fact. The assassin movement of Hasan bin Sabbah and the role played by Ibn-e-Alqami in the devastation of Baghdad by Holagu are some of the instances of the past Islamic history. The upsurge of Khomenieism in Iran is also the part of the old game of the Shi'ite history. Khomenieism has assumed a new and most dangerous dimension which has surpassed all the previous dangers. The uncompromising attitude in the ruinous war with Iraq, the turmoil at Mecca during the last year Haj pilgrimage, the mischievous move to internationalize the control of the holy cities of Islam and the sinister propaganda against the government of Saudi Arabia has exposed the Khomeini regime.

This article was taken from a book called "**Al-Khutoot Al-Areedah**" to give a vivid picture of the Shi'ite belief and faith. The reader will come across with some painful truths and horrible facts.

2 Introduction

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful All praise is due to the Almighty God, Allah. We praise Him and seek His help and forgiveness. And we seek refuge in Allah from the evils of our own selves and from our wicked deeds. Whosoever has been guided by Allah, there is none to misguide him. And whosoever has been misguided by Allah, none can guide him. And I bear witness that there is no other god except Allah, alone, without partner or associate. And I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger. May Allah the Exalted bestow His peace and blessings on the Prophet Muhammad, upon his good and pure family as well as upon all of the noble Companions and upon those who followed them in righteousness until the Day of Judgment.

It is intended through this translation of Al-Khutoot Al-Areedah to present to readers of English, both Muslims and non-Muslims accurate information about the faith and tenets of the Shi'ite sect known as the Twelve Imams or Ja'faris.

It is essential for the Sunni Muslim to know the fact of the Shi'ite deviation from the straight path of Islam taught by the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ) and his noble Companions (r.a.a.). Al-Khutoot Al-'Areedah clearly and briefly presents the actual teachings of the Shi'ites in general, and the Twelve Imams in particular. The reader will derive from the text an unequivocal understanding of the Shi'ite sect and will distance himself from them and their beliefs. He will realize that there can be no reconciliation nor reunification of the Sunnis and the schismatic Shi'ites until and unless the latter renounce their perverse tenets. They must return to the pure unadulterated teachings of Islam held and maintained by Ahlus-Sunnah wal-Jama'ah (the Sunnis).

Unfortunately, it is a common view in the West that the Irani Shi'ites and their so-called "Islamic revolution" with all its attendant turmoil, injustice and barbarism, are representatives of Islam. It is hoped that the non-Muslim reader of this work will come to perceive the abyss which separates the Shi'ites from the Muslim majority, and that he will no longer condemn all Muslims for the activities of one deviant sect.

3 The Predetermined Fact Of Sectarianism

The existence of numerous sects, the majority of which are deviant, is a predetermined fact referred to in the Glorious Qur'an:

And if your Lord [Allah] had so willed, He could have made mankind a single unified community, but they will not cease to dispute and differ; except those upon whom your Lord has bestowed His mercy. And for this did He create them, and the word of your Lord will be fulfilled: I will fill Hell with jinns and men altogether. (11-118, 119)

Furthermore, Allah's Prophet (p.b.u.h) had said: "Verily this nation [of Muslims] will divide into seventy-three sects", and in another narration: "All of them [these sects] will be in the Fire except one.' When asked which it was, the Prophet replied: "The one which adheres to my Sunnah (way of life) and the Sunnah of my Companions.'⁽¹⁾

Thus, it was incumbent upon us to bring to light the stark differences among the sects so that it may be perfectly clear what each sect believes in and adheres to that Allah's proof against His slaves may be established:

But that Allah might accomplish a matter already ordained [in His knowledge]; so that those who were destroyed [by rejecting faith] might be destroyed after a clear sign [had been given] and those who live [i.e. believers] might live after a clear sign [had been given]. And surely Allah is All-Hearer, All-Knower. (8:42)

Shi'ism originated in the first century of Islam as an exaggerated affection for and partisanship of Ahlul-Bait (the family and descendants of the Prophet Muhammad ﷺ). Later on, it developed into a set of misbeliefs and erroneous concepts which ultimately constituted a new religion; a religion other than that which was taught by the Prophet Muhammad (ﷺ), and by his Companions after him.

The Shi'ites claim to have a Qur'an other than the one which is unanimously recognized by all Muslims throughout the history of Islam. Furthermore, they reject the authentic compilations of the sacred traditions, such as those of the two great imams Al-Bukhari and Muslim. They consider all but a few-of the Companions of the Prophet Muhammad to be apostates, while they elevate their Imams to a position comparable to that of the gods of ancient mythology

Unfortunately, some naive or simple-minded Muslims are inclined to believe that the Shi'ites of today have abandoned their deviant tenets and have reverted to the right path. Grounds for such a belief are yet to be found.

A detailed exposition of the Shi'ite distortions and misconceptions will follow in this treatise, but at this point I will briefly touch on some of the views of the contemporary Shi'ite religious elite; the

ayatullahs and mullahs whose commands are obeyed and slavishly adhered to by the ordinary Shi'ite.

In a treatise entitled Tuhfatul-Awaam Maqbool, published recently, there appeared an invocation (2) endorsed by six of the most respected contemporary Shi'ite imams including Khomeini and Shariat-Madari. In that invocation, Abu Bakr and `Umar, may Allah be pleased with them, are accused of altering the Qur'an. Those two illustrious caliphs, along with their two daughters, who were the noble and pure wives of the Prophet (ﷺ) were cursed and reviled by the Shi'ites of today.

Khomeini, in his book Al-Hukoomatul-Islamiyyah (the Islamic government), claims that the Twelve Imams are infallible, and he raises them to a level above the heavenly angels and the commissioned prophets of Allah; he stresses: "Certainly, the Imam commands a noble station and lofty position; a creative vicegerency to who's rule and power submit the very atoms of all creation[!] And an essential tenet of our Shi'ite sect is that the Imams have a position which is reached neither by the angels [in the highest heaven] nor by any commissioned messenger of God (3)." He further stated: "The teachings and directives of the Imams are just like those of the Qur'an, it is compulsory on one to follow them and carry them out." (4)

In short, Khomeini and his fellow clergymen adhere to all of the perverse tenets of the Shi'ite faith as laid out in detail in Al-Kaafi. Khomeini clearly admits this in his book Al-Huloomatul-islamiah: "Do you think that it is enough for us, with respect to-our religion, to collect its rulings and directives in Al-Kaafi, then put it on a shelf and neglect it?"

Al-Khutoot Al-'Areedah, provides some details from Al-Kaafi, a foundation stone of the Shi'ite religion, so that the naive good-hearted Muslims may have a second thought before cherishing the idea that the Shi'ites of today are different from those of the past.

Abu Bilal Mustafa Al-Kanadi, Mecca and Vancouver Ramadan-Dhul-Qa'dah 1403 A.H. /1983 C.E.

4 THE CALL TO RECONCILIATION OF THE VARIOUS SECTS AND SCHOOLS OF THOUGHT

Bringing Muslims closer to each other in their thoughts, convictions and aims is one of the greatest objectives of Islam, and a most vital means of achieving Muslim unity, power, revival and reconstruction. When the call to such a purpose is free from ulterior motives and is likely to yield more benefit than harm, then it becomes incumbent on all Muslims to respond to it and to cooperate with each other to make it a success.

Discussion of this call had increased in recent years, and had such a pronounced effect that it attracted the attention of Al-Azhar University, one of the greatest religious institutions of those who adhere to the four schools of jurisprudence of Ahlus-Sunnahs (Sunni Muslims). Al-Azhar fully adopted the idea of bringing Muslim groups together and pursued it beyond the limits of its authority which had been established in the time of Salahuddin and maintained up until the present. Al-Azhar overstepped its bounds in its desire to explore and to accommodate various schools of thought, the foremost of which is the school of the Shi'ite Twelve Imams. (5)

Al-Azhar is, at this point, in the early stages of this mission. (6) Therefore, this topic is timely and worthy of research, study and exposition by every Muslim who has knowledge of the issue, in all its details and with all its ramifications. Since religious issues tend to be controversial in nature, they should be handled with wisdom, insight and straightforwardness. The researcher must also be enlightened by Allah's guidance and be impartial in his judgment in order that his research may achieve its claimed objectives and yield satisfactory results, if it be so willed by Allah.

It may be remarked that with any contentious issue involving more than one party, chances for its successful resolution are correlated to the responsiveness of the parties involved. With respect to the question of bringing Ahlus-Sunnah and the Shi'ites closer to each other, it has been noticed that a centre was established for this purpose in Egypt, financed by the government of a Shi'ite country.

This open-handed Shi'ite government has honored us with its generosity while it deprived itself and the adherents of its own school of thought of its governmental bounty. It has also been noticed that it did not build such a lavish establishment for the call to "reconciliation" in Tehran, Qum, Najaf, Jabal `Aamil, or any other centre known for its propagation of the Shi'ite school of thought.'

These Shi'ite propaganda centres published during the past years books that make one's skin crawl and one's body tremble from the shock of what is written therein. Reading them utterly destroys any idea we may have entertained of developing mutual understanding and closeness with their Shi'ite authors and the like of them. Among these publications is a book entitled Az-Zahraa, by Shi'ite scholars of Najaf, in which they alleged that Amirul Mu'mineen `Umar ibnu Khattaab, the second caliph, was plagued with a disease curable only by the water of men (i.e., semen)! This filthy slander was noted by the scholar Al-Basheer Al-Ibrahimi, the Sheikh of the Algerian `ulamaa, during his first visit to Iraq. A filthy soul which produces such wickedness is in a greater need of the call to understanding and reconciliation than we are.

The fundamental difference between them and us is rooted in their claim that they are more loyal to AhlulBait, and in the fact that they hide from us their malice towards and grudge against the Companions of the Prophet, on whose shoulders Islam was established. Their hatred reached such a point that they can utter the filthy words against `Umar ibnul-Khattaab that were noted above.

Is it not fair to say that they should have restrained their malice and hatred against the first Imams of Islam. and that they should have appreciated the noble stand of ahlus-Sunnah toward ahlulBait, that stand which never fell short in offering due homage and reverence to the family of the Prophet? Or do they consider us to be remiss in not taking the family of the Prophet as gods to be worshipped along with Allah, as they do?

Without a doubt, responsiveness to each other is essential if two parties are to achieve a mutual "coming together", reconciliation and understanding. This mutual responsiveness can only come about if there are sincere efforts on both sides to achieve it.

As stated above, there is a "reconciliation" centre in Egypt, a Sunni country; there are also propaganda offices which wage hostile campaigns against those who do not favour such centres. One might well question the absence of such centres or their like in any Shi'ite country. One also may question why Al-Azhar University has included instruction in the Shi'ite school of thought, while the Sunni schools of thought are still locked out of the Shi'ite educational institutions. If the call to reconciliation is restricted to one of the concerned parties alone, then the efforts spent on such a call will be futile.

Finally, one may question the value of beginning the process of reconciliation by attending to differences of a minor or secondary nature, while fundamental differences have not yet been addressed.⁽⁷⁾

5 ISLAMIC JURISPRUDENCE

The jurisprudence of the Sunnis differs from that of the Shi'ites even in the fundamentals upon which the law is based. Yet unless and until the fundamentals are understood and endorsed by both parties, and until there is a favorable response to this from the religious institutions of both sides, it would be useless to waste time dealing with issues of a minor or secondary nature.

In fact, it is not merely in the fundamentals of jurisprudence that there are differences, but also, and more importantly, in the fundamental articles of faith of each party, even in their deepest roots and origins.

6 The Question Of Taqiyyah

One of the main obstacle to their receiving a positive response from us is their tenet of taqiyyah (deception), by the application of which, they reveal to us other than what they have in their hearts. The simple-minded Sunni is deceived by their pretentious display of `the desire to overcome our differences and reach a common understanding between us and them. In fact, they neither want such a thing nor approve of it. They do not strive for it, but rather leave it to the other party to come the full distance to their position, without exerting an effort to make any move from their side. Even if those Shi'ites who practice taqiyyah were to convince us that they have moved a few steps in our direction, then the multitude of Shi'ites, be they ordinary people or the scholarly elite, would stand apart from those who adopted the ruse of objectivity towards us, and they would not recognize them as their representatives; this because their actual belief does not permit them to reconcile themselves with us.

7 Shi'ite Attack On The Noble Qur'an

The Qur'an should be the comprehensive reference for both Sunnis and Shi'ites, and a means of bringing about unity and mutual understanding, but it has been misinterpreted by the Shi'ites and given a meaning other than that which was understood by the noble Companions who received it directly from the Prophet, and other than that which was understood by the Imams of Islam who received it from the very generation amongst whom the Qur'an descended by way of Divine Revelation.

One of the most famous and respected Shi'ite scholars, from Najaf, Mirza Husain bin Muhammad Taqi An-Nawari At-Tabarsi, wrote in 1292 A.H. the book *faslul-Khitaab fee lthbatti Tahreefi Kitaab Rabbil-Arbaab* (The Decisive Say on the Proof of Alteration of the Book of the Lord of Lords). In this book he compiled hundreds of texts written by Shi'ite scholars in different eras alleging that the Qur'an has been tampered with, that there have been both additions to it and omissions from it.

At-Tabarsi's book was printed in Iran, in 1298 A.H., and its appearance attracted much attention, frustrating the intention of certain Shi'ites that their doubts about the authenticity of the Qur'an should be restricted to the elite of religious scholars and personalities. They preferred that these allegations not be brought together in a single volume, and widely disseminated, as it could be used as a proof against them by their opponents. When the scholars made public their criticism, At-Tabarsi responded with another book entitled *Raddu ba'dush-Shubahaati `an Faslil-Khitaabi fee lthbatti Tahreefi Kitaabi Rabbil-Arbaab* (Refutation of Some Specious Arguments Regarding the Decisive Say on the Proof of Alteration of the Book of the Lord of the Lords). He wrote this defense of his original book two years before his death. In order to show their appreciation of his contribution to the attempt to prove that the Qur'an had been altered, the Shi'ites buried him in one of their most prominent religious shrines, at Najaf.

Among the proofs offered by At-Tabarsi in his attempt to show that the Qur'an had been altered, was a quotation from what the Shi'ites consider to be a missing part of the Qur'an, called by them *Suratul-Wilaayah* (see below). It mentions the granting of *wilaayah* (sovereignty) to `Ali (ؑ) as follows: "O believers, believe in the Prophet and the wali, the two whom We sent to guide you to the straight path..."[*suratul-Wilayah*]

(So-called *Suratul-Wilaayah*)



سورة الولاية - منقولة بطور اريائي عن أحد مصاحف إيران

وعل كاجنة منها ترجمتها بالفارسية

Photocopy of the so-called Surat-ul-wilaayah which the Shi'ites accuse the Sunni Muslims of deleting it along with other suras from the original text of the Holy Qur'an. It reads:

O' you who believe, believe in the prophet and the wali, the two whom we sent to guide you to the straight path. A prophet and wali who are of each other. and celebrate the praise of your Lord, and Ali is among the witnesses.

[fatwa against companions]

Photocopy of the original fatwa (religious verdict) encouraging the Shi'ite masses to curse the two Caliphs Abu Bakr and `Umar. signed by six of the contemporary Shi'ite scholars and clergy among them Khomeini and Shariat Madari The trustworthy scholar Muhammad `Ali Sa'oodi, chief consultant to the Egyptian Ministry of Justice, and one of Sheikh Muhammad Abduh's special students, managed to examine an Iranian manuscript copy of the Qur'an owned by the orientalist Brown. He was able to make a photocopy of Surat-ul-Wilaayah with its Persian translation. Its existence was affirmed by At-Tabarsi in his book faslul-Khitaab, and by Muhsin Faani Al-ashmeeri in his book Dabisan Madhaahib. This book, written in Persian, was printed several times in Iran. The chapter (Surat-ul-Wilaayah) which is falsely attributed to Allah's revelation, was also quoted by the famous orientalist Noeldeke in his book History of the Copies of the Qur'an⁽⁹⁾. It also appeared in the Asian-French Newspaper in 1842 C.E.

At-Tabarsi also quoted a tradition from Al-Kaafi, which is to the Shi'ites what Sahih-ul-Bukhari is to the Sunni Muslims. It reads:

A number of our associates narrated by way of Sahl bin Ziyaad through Muhammad bin Sulaiman that some of his friends reported Abul-Hasan Ath-Thaani `Ali bin Mioosa Ar-Rida as saying `May I be your ransom! We hear verses of the Qur'an different from those we have with us and we are not capable of reading them according to your reading which has reached us. Do we commit a sin thereby He replied, "No, read the Qur'an as you have learned it; someone will come to you to teach you."

Without a doubt, this conversation is fabricated by the Shi'ites and is falsely attributed to the Imam `Ali bin Moosa Ar-Rida; however, the statement is taken by the Shi'ites as a legal ruling in this matter. Its implication is that while one of them commits no sin by reciting the Qur'an the way Muslims have learned according to `Uthman's unanimously accepted text, the privileged class of Shi'ite clergy and scholars will teach each other a version other than the accepted one, a version which they claim came to their Imams from AhlulBait.

It was the urge to strike a comparison between the Shi'ite "Qur'an" (which they secretly confide to one another, while hiding it from the general public as an act of taqiyyah") and the known and officially accepted `Uthmani Edition of the Qur'an, which motivated At-Tabarsi to write his book faslul-Khitaab.

Although the Shi'ites pretended to disown At-Tabarsi's book, as an act of taqiyyah, the glaring fact that it includes hundreds of quotations from the recognized works of their scholars clearly confirms their adherence to the tenet of alteration of the Qur'an. Of course, they do not want a clamor to be raised over this perverse article of faith of theirs

The intended result of their claim is to leave us with the impression that there are two Qur'ans: one, the `Uthmani version accepted by the Sunni Muslims; the other, the allegedly hidden version of the Shi'ites, part of which is Surat-ul-Wilaayah. They are well aware that they fabricated the statement they attributed to the Imam `Ali bin Moosa Ar-Rida: "... read [the Qur'an] as you have learned it; someone will come to you to teach you." The Shi'ites also claim that a verse was deleted from the Qur'an from Surat-ul-Inshiraah. The alleged deletion is "and we made `Ali your son-in-law." Have they no shame in making such an allegation, when it is a well-known fact that this particular surah was revealed in Mecca at a time when `Ali was not yet the son-in-law of the Prophet, Allah's blessing and peace be upon him. His only son-in-law at that time was Al-'Ass Ibnur-Rabee'al-Ummawi. As for the fact that `Ali was a son-in-law of the Prophet, it should be pointed out that Allah

also made `Uthman bin `Affaan the son-in-law of the Prophet through his marriage to two of the Prophet's daughters. Upon the death of the second of `Uthman's wives (the second of the two daughters), the Prophet said to him, "If we had a third one, we would have given her to you in marriage."

Another of the Shi'ite scholars, Abu Mansoor Ahmad bin `Ali At-Tabarsi, in his book Al-Ihtijaaj `ala Ahlil-Lajaaj (Argumentation with the Contentious Folk) claimed that `Ali said to one of the zanaadiqah,⁽¹⁰⁾ whose name At-Tabarsi neglected to mention, "As for your belligerent disagreement with me⁽¹¹⁾, it shows your feigned ignorance of Allah's statement, `And if you fear that you will not deal justly with the orphans, then marry of the women who seem good to you..." At-Tabarsi then went on to say, by way of explanation as to why this verse was quoted by `Ali in his argumentation with his opponents:

Now doing justice to orphans does not resemble the marrying of women, and not all women are orphans; thus, this verse is an example of what I have presented earlier in the book Al-Ihtijaaj; regarding the deletion of parts of the Qur'an by the hypocrites,⁽¹²⁾ that deletion being between the statement about justice to orphans, and that which follows it, about the marrying of women. This deletion consists of addresses and stories, and amounts to more than a third of the Qur'an.

8 SHI'ITE LIES, EVEN AGAINST `ALI

The foregoing is an example of the Shi'ite lies which were attributed to `Ali may Allah be pleased with him). That it is a slanderous fabrication is proven by the fact that `Ali never declared, during the whole period of his caliphate, that a third of the Qur'an was missing from the section mentioned above. He did not command the Muslims to record this "missing" portion, nor to seek guidance from it, nor to apply jurisprudential rulings derived from it.

9 REJOICING OF THE MISSIONARIES AND ORIENTALISTS

Upon the publication of the book Faslul-Khitaab over eighty years ago, there was great rejoicing amongst the enemies of Islam, in particular, the missionaries and orientalist. They liked the book so much that they decided to translate it into their own languages. It is no wonder, since it contained hundreds of lies such as those mentioned above, along with slanderous fabrications against Allah and the choicest of His creation, the Holy Prophet of Islam (upon whom be peace), and against the venerable Companions (may Allah be pleased with them all).⁽¹³⁾

There are two clear texts from Al-Kaafi of Al-Kulaini, which elucidate the Shi'ites' perverse position regarding the Qur'an. The first reads:

I heard Abu Jafar (upon whom be peace) say: "None of the people has claimed that he collected the Quran completely as it was revealed except a liar. No one collected and memorized the Qur'an as it was revealed except `Ali bin Abi Taalib and the Imams after him."⁽¹⁴⁾

Every Shi'ite is required to believe in this text from Al-Kaafi as an article of their faith. As for us, Ahlus-Sunnah, we say that in fact the Shi'ites have falsely attributed the above text to Al-Baaqir Abu Ja'far. The proof of our position is that `Ali, during the period of his caliphate in Kufah, never resorted to or applied any version of the Qur'an other than that with which Allah had favored the Caliph `Uthman by the distinction of its collection, publication and popularization and by its legal application in all Islamic lands for all time up to the Day of Judgment. If it were true that `Ali had a different version of the Qur'an he surely would have applied it in making legal rulings, and he would have commanded the Muslims to abide by its injunctions and guidance. Clearly, since he was the supreme ruler, none would have challenged his authority to do this.

Furthermore, if indeed `Ali had a different version of the Qur'an and concealed it from the Muslims, then he would have betrayed Allah, His Messenger and the religion of Islam by so doing. As for

Jaabir Al-Ju'fi who claims that he heard that blasphemous conversation from the Imam Abi la'far Muhammad Al-Baaqir, it must be noted that although the Shi'ites consider him a trustworthy narrator of traditions, the fact is that he is well known in the Sunni schools of theology as a liar and forger of traditions. Abu Yahya Al-Hammani reported that he heard the Imam Abu Hanifa saying, "Ataa' is the best i.e., the most truthful and precise in reporting from amongst those I have come across in the field of transmitting traditions, while Jaabir Al-Ju'fi is the greatest liar I have come across amongst them."⁽¹⁵⁾

The second of the two texts from Al-Kaafi mentioned above, is attributed to the son of Ja'far

As-Saadiq. It reads:

It is related that Abu Baser said: "I entered upon Abu `Abdullah [Ja'far As-Sadiq]... [Who] said `Verily we have with us the Qur'an of Fatimah (upon whom be peace).' I said: `What is the Qur'an of Fatimah?' He replied: `It contains three times as much as this Qur'an of yours. By Allah, it does not contain one single letter of your Qur'an' ."⁽¹⁶⁾

These fabricated Shi'ite texts which are falsely attributed to the Imams of Ahlul-Bait are of fairly early date. They were recorded by Muhammed bin Ya'qoob Al-Kulaini Ar-Razi in the book Al-Kaafi over a thousand years ago, and they are from before his time, because they were narrated on the authority of his ancestors, the master engineers of the false foundations of Shi'ism. During the time when Spain was under the reign of Arab Muslims, the Imam Abu Muhammad bin Hazam used to debate with Spain's priests regarding the texts of their sacred books. He used to bring forth proofs which established their having been tampered with, and altered so much that their authentic origins had been lost. Those priests used to argue with Ibn Hazam that the Shi'ites had asserted that the Qur'an also had been altered. Ibn Hazam refuted their argument by replying that the allegation of the Shi'ites is not a proof against the Qur'an, nor against the Muslims, because Shi'ites are not Muslims.⁽¹⁷⁾

10 SHI'ITE VIEWS ON THE MUSLIM RULERS

The attention of the governments of all Muslim nations must be drawn to the dangerous and distorted views of the (So-called) Shi'ite Twelve Imams, or Ja'fari sect. It is their view that all governments from the death of the Prophet-until now are illegitimate, except for that of `Ali bin Abi Taalib. It is therefore not permissible for any Shi'ite to be loyal to- those governments or sincere in dealing with them. Indeed, they must engage in flattery and hypocrisy, in accordance with their tenet of taqiyyah. They consider all past, present, and future governments in the Muslim world to be established by forcible seizure, and therefore illegal. According to them, the only legitimate rulers are the Twelve Imams, whether they ruled directly or indirectly, and all other rulers, from the time of Abu Bakr and `Umar until the present time, are considered usurpers, and oppressors of the people. The Shi'ites tenaciously hold this perverse view of the Muslim rulers regardless of the great services they have rendered to the noble cause of Islam, and to humanity in general.

11 MALICE AGAINST ABU BAKR AND `UMAR

The Shi'ites curse Abu Bakr, `Umar and `Uthman (may Allah be pleased with them), along with all the rulers of the Islamic Nation, with the exception of `Ali. They fabricated a lie and attributed it to the Imam Abul Hasan `Ali bin Muhammad bin `Ali bin Moosa, claiming that he approved of his followers calling Abu Bakr and `Umar "Al-jibt wat- Taaghoot".⁽¹⁸⁾ This claim was made in one of their most extensive works on the science of the ascertainment of the veracity and competence of the narrators of Prophetic Traditions, Tanqeehul-Maqaal fee Ahwaalir- Rijaal, by a sheikh of the Ja'fari sect Allama Ath-Thani Ayatullah Al- Mamqaani.⁽¹⁹⁾

Al-Mamqaani referred to the scholar Ash-Sheikh Muhammad bin Idrees Al-Hilli's book As-Saraa'ir, in which Al-Hilli cited the work Massaa'ilur-aijaal wa Mukaatabatihim ila Mowlaana Abil-Hasan `Ali bin

Muhammad bin `Ali bin Moosa, the subject of which is questions and letters directed to Abil Hasan `Ali bin Muhammad. Among them is a question from Muhammad bin `Ali, who is quoted as saying:

I wrote to him asking about ar-naasib [one who is hostile to Ahlil-Bait]. I asked him whether I needed proof of his hostility towards Ahlil-Bait other than his recognition of Al-jibt wat-Taaghoot i.e. Abu Bakr and `Umar] as the rightful holders of the office of imam [leader of the Muslim community].

His reply was that anyone whose condition was like that just described, was adequately shown to be a naasib.

Thus, any person would be counted as an enemy of the Prophet's family merely by his giving precedence of rank to Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq and `Umar Al-Farooq, and by his acknowledging their positions as imams. The expression "Al-Jibt wat-Taaghoot" is used by the Shi'ites in the prayer of imprecation which they call "Du'aa Sanamay Quraish" (imprecation against the two idols of the Quraish). They mean by these expressions, the two caliphs Abu Bakr and `Umar (may Allah be pleased with them). This vicious Shi'ite prayer of imprecation is mentioned in their book Miftahul-Jinaan; it reads: "O Allah, bestow Your blessings upon the Holy Prophet Muhammad and upon his family, and curse the two idols of the Quraish, their Al-Jibt wat-Taaghoot, as well as their two daughters..." They are referring to the two Mothers of the Believers, Aa'ishah and Hafsa, the pure and noble wives of the Prophet (may Allah be pleased with them).

12 Shi'ites Exalt The Assassin Of The Caliph `Umar

The hatred the Shi'ites have for the Caliph `Umar reached such a pitch that they gave his murderer Abu Lu'lu'ah Al-Majoosi the title `Baba Shujaa'ud-Din" (the one who is brave in the cause of religion).

`Ali bin Mathahir, a Shi'ite narrator of traditions, reported that Ahmad bin Ishaq Al-Qummi Al-Ahwas, a sheikh of the Shi'ites, said: "Verily the day `Umar was murdered- is the greatest day of celebration, the day of pride and honour, the day of the great purification and the day of blessing and consolation."

In the history of Islam there have been many great personalities, men like the two Caliphs Abu Bakr and `Umar and the great warrior Salahuddin Al-Ayyoobi, who ruled for the sake of Islam, and who conquered various lands and peoples and brought them into the fold of Islam. Yet these great men, and indeed all of the great rulers of Islam, past and present, are believed by the Shi'ites to be overpowering tyrants and illegal rulers and consequently, are considered to be inhabitants of Hell-Fire. Among the Shi'ites' most important tenets is the belief that when their Twelfth Imam, the awaited [Mahdi](#), rises and comes forth after his long absence of over eleven hundred years, and brings his revolution, then Allah will resurrect for him and for his forefathers, the past and present Muslim rulers, including the two noble Caliphs Abu Bakr and `Umar. Those Muslim rulers will then be tried for having illegally seized the reins of government from the [Mahdi](#) and his ancestors, the first eleven Imams of the Shi'ite religion. This, as they believe, is because government is the God-given right of the Shi'ites alone, from the time of the Prophet Muhammad' death until the Final Hour!

After the trial of those "tyrannous usurpers", this awaited Mahdi will awaken himself by ordering their execution. Five hundred of them at a time will be killed until their number reaches three thousand. this; being the total of all who ruled during the various eras of the history of Islam!

All of this is supposed to occur just before the final revival of mankind on the Day of Resurrection! It is a prelude, as it were, to that final great gathering and resurrection, the result of which is either Paradise or Hell-Fire; Paradise for Ahlul-Bait and the Shi'ites, and the Fire for everyone who is not a Shi'ite!

The Shi'ites call this resurrection of the Muslim rulers, and the subsequent trial and execution, "Ar-Raj'ah" (the return). This belief is one of the fundamental tenets of their faith, which no common Shi'ite doubts at all. I have met a number of naive and simple-minded people who claim that the

Shi'ites have departed from such tenets as these in recent times; however, this is a gross error on their part as is evident from the actual state of affairs.

13 DESIRE FOR REVENGE AND DESTRUCTION

In Al-Irshaad fee Taarikhi Hujajillahi `alal-Ibaad (Instruction in the History of God's Proofs Against His Slaves), Abu `Abdullah Muham- mad An-Nu'man, known to the Shi'ites by the title `Ash-Sheikhul- Mufeed", quoted several of their "traditions" about "Ar-Raj'ah": Al Fadl bin Sha'thaan reported that Muhammad bin `Ali Al-Koofi related that Wahab bin Hafs narrated through Abi Baseer that Abu `Abdullah [Ja'far As-Saadiq] said: "The [Mahdi](#) will be called upon on the Twenty-third night by the name 'The Risen One'. He will arise, and that rising up will be on the day of `ashooraa. ⁽²⁰⁾ It is as if I am there with him on that tenth day of the month of Muharram. He is standing between the corner of the Ka'bah containing the black stone, and the maqaam [place of prayer] of the Prophet Abraham. The Angel Gabriel is standing to his right calling out, 'The pledge of allegiance to the [Mahdi](#) is for the sake of Allah!' Then the Shi'ites will march towards the Mahdi to give him the pledge, from all corners of the earth. that having been made easy for them to achieve. There has come to us the report that the Mahdi will ravel from Macca until he arrives at Koota and settles in our [Shi'ite] holy city of Najaf. Then he will dispatch armies from there to the various lands."

It was also reported, by Al-Hajjaal from Thlaha via Abu Bakr Al- Hadrami that Abu Ja'far [Muhammad Al-Baaqir] said: "It is as if I am with the Risen One at the city of Najaf, in Al-Koofa

which he had marched to from Mecca, in the company of five thousand angels, with Gabriel on his right side, and Michael on his left, and the believers in front of him, while he dispatches armies to the various countries."

So too, it is narrated that `Abdul-Kareem Al-Ju'fi reported: "I said to Abu `Abdullah [Ja'far As-Saadiq]: 'How long will the Risen One's reign last?' ;Seven years,' he replied. He elaborated: 'The days will grow longer, till a year of his reign equals ten of your years. His reign will last for seventy years of your reckoning.' Upon this, Abu Baseer said to him [i.e., to Ja'far As-Saadiq]: 'May I be your ransom! How will Allah make the years longer?' The reply was: 'Allah will command the celestial spheres to decrease in their speed of movement, and the days and years will consequently become longer. When the time of his rising up arrives, rain will fall during the last month of Jumada and for ten days of Rajab, a rain which the world has never seen before. Allah shall cause the flesh of believers and their bodies to come to life in their graves. It is as if I am seeing the resurrected ones coming forward, shaking the soil out of their hair."

`Abdullah bin Al-Mugheera narrated that Abu `Abdullah [Ja'far As- Saadiq] said: "If the awaited Mahdi from the family of Muhammad rises, he will cause to be raised up five hundred members of Quraish, and their necks would be struck by the sword. They would be followed by another set of five hundred, and yet another, until that recurred six times." "Would they reach that great number?" I asked. [His astonishment upon hearing that great number was due to the fact that the rightly-guided Caliphs, the Umayyad rulers and those of the Ab- basi era, along with all the Muslim rulers up until the time of Ja'far As- Saadiq do not amount to a hundredth of that number.] Ja'far As- Saadiq replied: "Yes; it includes the rulers and their supporters."

And in another narration: "Verily, our state is the last of the states. There would be no dynasty but that which has had its turn before us, so that there may be none to witness our reign and say: If we were to rule we would follow their path."

Jaabir Al-Ju'fi reported that Abu `Abdullah [Ja'far As-Saadiq] said: "When the risen Mahdi from the family of Muhammad comes forth he will pitch pavilions to teach therein the Qur'an just as it was revealed. ⁽²¹⁾

It will be most difficult then for the one who has memorized [that which is memorized] today." [i.e., it would be difficult for the one who memorized the official `Uthmani edition which was extant at the time of Ja'far As-Saadiq, because it would differ from the version which the Mahdi supposedly will

bring.] Al-Mufaddal bin `Umar narrated that Abu `Abdullah said: Along ,with the Risen One shall come twenty-seven men from the people of the Prophet Moses, seven from the people of the cave, and Joshua, Solomon Abu Dujaanal Al-Ansaari, Al-Miqdaad and Maalik Al-Ashtar. These will be in the company of the Mahdi as helpers and judges in his service."

These fabricated "traditions" from the book of "Ash-Sheikhul-Mufeed", have been quoted meticulously, complete with their concocted chains of transmission. They have been falsely attributed to the family of the Prophet, whose greatest misfortune is to have such liars pretending to be their only partisans.

Of course, since the belief in Ar-Raj'ah and the trial of the Muslim rulers is an important part of Shi'ite doctrine, it is commonly mentioned in the works of Shi'ite scholars and clergy. One example is Al-Masail An-Naasiriya, by As-Sawid Al-Murtadaa, in which is to be found the following: "Verily Abu Bakr and `Umar shall be crucified upon a tree in the time of Al-Mahdi... That tree would be green and tender before the crucifixion and would turn parched after the crucifixion."

14 SHI'ITES' WAY OF THINKING UNCHANGED

The Shi'ite scholars and clergy throughout the span of Islamic history have taken a disgraceful stand against the two Companions and appointed ministers of Allah's Prophet, Abu Bakr and `Umar, and against other great Islamic personalities such as the Caliphs, governors, generals, and warriors in the sacred cause of Islam. Now we have heard their propagandist, who was responsible for Darut-Taqreeb (the centre for the promotion of "reconciliation" and a "coming together" of Sunnis and Shi'ites), claiming before those who were unable to critically study these issues themselves, that these beliefs were held in the old days, and that the situation now is different. This claim is plainly false and misleading, because the books which are taught in all of their educational institutions contain all of these tenets and hold them as essential and rudimentary elements of their faith. Furthermore, the books presently being published by the scholars of Iran, Najaf and Mount `Aamil are even more evil than the older Shi'ite publications, and more detrimental to the cause of reconciliation and mutual understanding.

To further clarify this we mention as an example one person amongst them who never ceases announcing day and night that he is a proponent of unity and reconciliation, Muhammad bin Muhammad Mahdi Al-Khaalisi. He is known to have many friends in Egypt and elsewhere who broadcast the same call for taqreeb, and who work for it among the Ahlus-Sunnah. This supposed advocate of "unity and understanding" goes so far as to deny that Abu Bakr and `Umar possessed the grace of Iman (faith). In his book Ihyaa'ush-Sharia fee Madhhabish-Shi'ah (Revival of the Law in the Shi'ite School of Thought), he says:

Even if they [Sunnis] argue that Abu Bakr and `Umar were among the people of Bai'atur- Ridwan⁽²²⁾ with whom Allah was pleased, as shown by the reference made to them in the Qur'an: "Verily Allah was pleased with the believers when they swore allegiance to you (Muhammad) beneath the tree",⁽²³⁾ we say that if Allah had said: "Verily Allah was pleased with those who swore allegiance to you beneath the tree", then the verse would indicate that Allah's pleasure included everyone who made the pledge of allegiance. Since the verse says: "Verily Allah was pleased with the believers when they swore allegiance.. .", there is therefore no proof in this verse that Allah is pleased with anyone except those who have acquired pure iman.

Al-Khaalisi is insinuating by this that Abu Bakr and `Umar were of those who had not acquired iman- and were excluded from the pleasure of Allah.⁽²⁴⁾

15 DISTORTION OF HISTORICAL FACTS

Al-Murtadaa and Al-Khaalisi are modern Shi'ite scholars who boldly claim to belong to the echelon of those who are zealous in struggling for the sake of Islam and Muslims, and who have the keenest

interest in upholding the rights of Muslims and maintaining their well-being. Having seen, however, what they have written about Abu Bakr and `Umar, who are among the best of Muslims next to the Prophet, ordinary people like ourselves must wonder what hope there can be of our reaching a common understanding and reconciliation with people such as them.

While on the one hand the Shi'ites shamelessly defame the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, and those who followed them in piety, and succeeded them as rulers, on the other hand we find them ascribing to their Imams attributes of such extravagant description, that the Imams themselves would wish to declare their innocence of them.

Al-Kulaini recorded in his book Al-Kaafi attributes and descriptions of the Twelve Imams such as would imply their elevation from the human level to that of the gods of the ancient Greek pagans. To quote all such fables from Al-Kaafi and other books would require a large volume. By way of illustration, it will suffice to list some of the chapter headings from Al-Kaafi:

* "The Imams possess all the knowledge granted to angels, prophets and messengers" (25) * "The Imams know when they will die, and they do not die except by their own choice" (26) * "The Imams have knowledge of whatever occurred in the past and whatever will happen in the future, and nothing is concealed from them" (27) * The Imams have knowledge of all the revealed books, regardless of the languages in which they were revealed" (28) * "No one compiled the Qur'an completely except the Imams, and they encompass all of its knowledge" (29) * "Signs of the prophets are possessed by the Imams" (30) * "When the Imams' time comes, they will rule in accordance with the ruling of the Prophet David and his dynasty. These Imams will not need to ask for presentation of evidence before passing their judgments" (31) * "There is not a single truth possessed by a people save that which originated with the Imams, and everything which did not proceed from them is false" (32) * "All of the earth belongs to the Imams" (32)

16 THE SHI'ITES PLACE THEIR IMAMS ABOVE THE MESSENGER

While the Shi'ites claim for the Twelve Imams the superhuman power of knowledge that encompasses the realm of the unseen, they deny the Prophet's knowledge of unseen things granted him by Allah, things such as the creation of the heavens and the earth, and the description of Paradise and Hell-Fire.

This blasphemy was stated in the magazine Risalatul-Islam (The Message of Islam), published by Darut-Taqreeb. In an article entitled Min Ijtihadati Shi'a Al-Imamia (Some Independent Shi'ite Opinions), the head of the Shi'ite supreme court in Lebanon quoted the Mujtahid scholar Muhammad Hasan Al-Ishtiyani: If the Prophet made a stipulation regarding the divine legal rulings on what invalidates ablution, or the rulings pertaining to menstruation and post-natal bleeding, it is imperative to believe him, and the application of these rulings is binding upon us. But if the Prophet made a statement regarding the unseen, for example on the creation of the heavens and earth, or the virgins of Paradise and its palaces, then it is not incumbent or binding upon one, even when it is known of a surety that the statement has proceeded from the Prophet.

How strange, that they should falsely attribute to their Imams knowledge of the unseen, and that they should adhere to that falsehood although they have not a single proof to establish its verity.

Meanwhile they consider that they are not bound to accept the revelations of the unseen mentioned in verses of the Qur'an and authentic traditions, and thereby conclusively proven. Add to all this that everything which has been verified to issue from the Prophet is nothing other than "revelation revealed" to him; and truly the Prophet does not speak from his own desires.

He who makes a comparison between what the Shi'ites ascribe to their Imams and what is authentically attributed to the Prophet regarding matters of the unseen comes to the conclusion that what can be verified to issue from the Prophet regarding the unseen, as mentioned in the Qur'an and the authentic, authoritative traditions does not even constitute a fraction of the multitude

of fabricated reports of knowledge of the unseen which are attributed to the Twelve Imams; and this in spite of the indisputable fact that divine revelation had totally ceased upon the death of the Prophet.

As for those who attributed this knowledge of the unseen to the Twelve Imams, it suffices to say that they are well known to the Sunni scholars of hadith (prophetic traditions) as liars, and forgers of hadith literature. The Shi'ite partisans of those narrators are indifferent to this, however, and blindly accept the accounts of the unseen which are imputed to their Imams. They also gladly accept the claim that acceptance of what had been authentically attributed to the Prophet with regard to the unseen is not binding upon them. In fact, it pleases them to limit the scope of the mission of the Messenger of Allah to matters of a secondary juristical nature, such as those mentioned by Al-Ishtiyani (see above).

Since they elevate the status of their Imams, in regard to knowledge of the unseen, above that of the Messenger of Allah (even though it was he who received the revelation; their Imams did not claim it for themselves), we do not know how there could develop, after such blasphemy, any reconciliation between us and them.

17 SHI'ITE TREACHERY TOWARDS ISLAMIC GOVERNMENTS

The stance of most Shi'ites, scholars and laymen alike, towards the Islamic governments throughout history has been, if the government was powerful and well-established, to honour its leaders in consonance with their tenet of taqiyah, for the purpose of material gain. If, however, the government is weak, or is under attack by enemies, they side with its enemies against it. This is precisely what they did during the last days of the Umayyad dynasty when the Abbasids revolted, under the instigation of the Shi'ites of that era. In a later time, they took the same criminal stand against the Abbasids who were threatened by the raids of Hulago and his pagan Mongol followers against the Caliphate of Islam and its glorious capital of science and civilization. An example of this is seen in the behavior of the Shi'ite philosopher and scholar An-Naseer At-Toosi. He composed poetry in praise of Al-Musta'sim, the Abbasid Caliph, then in 65 A.H. executed a complete turn about, instigating revolution against his patron, thereby hastening the catastrophe which befell Islam in Baghdad, where he headed the butcher Hulago's blood-letting procession. In fact he personally supervised the slaughter of Muslims, sparing none, not even women, children, or the aged. This same At-Toosi also approved of wholesale dumping of valuable texts of Islamic literature in the Tigris River; its waters ran black for days from the ink of the innumerable manuscripts. Thus vanished a great treasure of the Islamic heritage consisting of works in history, literature, language and poetry, not to mention those in the Islamic religious sciences, which had been passed down from the pious of the first generation of Muslims, and which could be found in abundance until that time when they were destroyed in a cultural holocaust the like of which had never been seen before.

18 THE TREACHERY OF AL-'ALQAMI AND IBN ABIL-HADEED

This sheikh of the Shi'ites, An-Naseer At-Toosi, was assisted in this great treachery by two of his cohorts, Muhammad bin Ahmad Al-'Alqami, a Shi'ite minister of state, and `Abdul-Hameed bin Abil-Hadeed, a Mu'tazilite author and extremist Shi'ite.⁽³³⁾ He was Al-'Alqami's right-hand man and proved to be a bitter enemy of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, as is evident from his malicious commentary on the book Nahjul-Balaaha, which he filled with lies in order to distort Islamic history.

Unfortunately, a number of our distinguished figures and authors continue to be deceived by such lies due to their ignorance of the essential facts of Islamic history. Al-'Alqami responded to Caliph Al-Musta'sim's kindness and generosity in making him his minister, with deception and treachery. Shi'ites to this day maliciously rejoice at Hulago's vicious campaign of slaughter and destruction, out of sheer animosity towards Islam. Anyone who wishes can read about the life of An-Naseer At-Toosi in any Shi'ite book of biographies, the latest of which is Rowdaatul-Iannaat by Al-Khuwansari. It is full of praise for the treacherous murderers, and reflects the Shi'ites' malicious rejoicing at that

disastrous massacre of Muslim men, women and children. It was a monstrous act which even the worst of enemies and the most hard- hearted beasts would be ashamed to show pleasure in.

19 AN IMPEDIMENT TO RECONCILIATION

The exposition has become somewhat lengthy although great care has been taken to restrict the subject matter wholly to quotations selected from the Shi'ites' most authentic and dependable publications. We would like to conclude with a quotation pertaining to the subject of at-taqreeb (reconciliation of the followers of the various schools and sects), in order to clarify for every Muslim what the actual possibilities for success are regarding such an endeavor, especially in regard to the Shi'ites who have expressed their own frank acknowledgment of the impossibility of such an attempt at reconciliation.

In his book Rowdaat lannaat, the Shi'ite historian Al- Khuwansari wrote of the "elegant and truthful utterances" of An- Naseer At-Toosi, "this source of truth and verification", and quoted his statement identifying the one and only sect of the seventy-three Muslim sects⁽³⁴⁾ that, according to prophecy, would achieve salvation:

I have considered all the sects and scrutinized them closely, only to find that all, save the Imamers, subscribe to the same general conditions of iman, while they differ only on some related issues. I discovered that the Imamer sect differs from and is opposed to all the others. If any sect other than the Imamers is considered "saved" then they all must be so considered. This indicates to me that the one sect which is to achieve salvation is none other than the Imamers.

20 SALVATION CANNOT BE ATTAINED WITHOUT PLEDGING ALLEGIANCE AND GRANTING SOVEREIGNTY TO AHLIL-BAIT

Al-Khuwansari also related that As-Sayyid Ni'matullah Al- Moosawi said:

All of the sects unanimously agree that bearing witness to one's faith by recitation of the two articles of faith is the only way to salvation, as proved by the statement of Allah's Messenger: "Whoever bears witness that there is no God but Allah enters Paradise." But as for the Imamer sect they unanimously agree that salvation is attained only by granting allegiance and entrusting the government to Ahlil-Bait, the last of whom is the Twelve Imam, and by disowning their enemies [i.e., Abu Bakr, `Umar and all non-Shi'ites, whether they were rulers or subjects]. Thereby Shi'ites differ entirely from all the other sects with regards to the nature and prerequisites of iman, upon which the issue of salvation devolves.

21 SHI'ITES DIFFER WITH MUSLIMS IN FUNDAMENTALS, NOT ONLY IN THE SECONDARY ISSUES

At-Toosi, Al-Moosa and Al-Khuwansari have both told the truth, and lied. They have told the truth in saying that all the Muslim sects are close to each other in fundamentals while they differ on secondary issues. Thus mutual understanding and a "coming together" are possible among those sects which are fundamentally akin to each other. On the other hand it is impossible to achieve such a mutual understanding with the Shi'ite Imamers because they are in opposition to the fundamentals of all other Muslims. They will never be pleased with the Muslims unless they curse "Al-jibt wat-Taaghoot" (Abu Bakr and `Umar), and those who came after them up until the present time.

Another condition they would impose on Muslims is that they disown all non-Shi'ites, and even those members of the family of the Prophet who were given in marriage to them, such as the two daughters of the Prophet who married the Caliph `Uthman bin `Affaan. They further stipulate that Muslims must also disown the Imam Zaid, son of `Ali Zain-ul `Abideen (the son of Al-Husain, son of `Ali bin Abi Taalib) along with the rest of the family of the Prophet who did not enter the ranks under

the banner of the Rafidites⁽³⁵⁾, and who did not accept their deviated tenets. Amongst these perverse tenets is their claim that the Qur'an has been tampered with, a doctrine fanatically adhered to by all classes of the Shi'ite society throughout the ages, as their own astute scholar At-Tabirisi has so boldly recorded in his book *hslul-Khitaabi fee Ithbatti Tahreefi Kitaab Rabbil-Arbaab*.

The Shi'ites would like to force upon us as a precondition to reaching a mutual understanding with them, and to please them, for the purpose of "coming closer" to them, that we curse along with them the Companions of Allah's Messenger, and that we disown everyone who does not adhere to the doctrines of the Shi'ite faith. They even expect us to disown the daughters of Allah's Messenger, and his blessed descendants, the foremost of whom is Zaid bin Zain-ul `Abideen, along with anyone who followed in his footsteps in rejecting the abominations of the Rafidites.

The above is the truthful part of what the Shi'ite spokesmen said, and no Shi'ite would deny it, whether he openly practiced taqiyyah, or concealed it.

As for the false part of what they say, it is that non-Shi'ite Muslims agree that upon simple utterance of the two Shahaadas⁽³⁶⁾ rests the issue of salvation in the Hereafter. If the Shi'ites had the slightest sense or knowledge they would have known that the two Shahaadas are to Sun ni Muslims the mere sign of entry into Islam. If one uttered these two Shahaadas, even if he were in the ranks of the enemy battling against Muslims, his life and wealth would become inviolable. As for salvation in the Hereafter, it is attained only by coupling the utterance of testification with iman, and iman, according to the great and pious caliph `Umar bin Abdul-'Azeed, consists of obligatory duties, and religious rites, ordinances and practices. He who fulfills these completes the prerequisites of iman, and whosoever does not fulfill them does not complete his iman. As for the Shi'ite belief in the existence of their Twelfth Imam, it is not in any way a prerequisite of iman. In fact, this Twelfth Imam is an imaginary character falsely identified as the son of Al-Hasan Al-'Askari (who died without offspring). His brother la'far settled and distributed the inheritance left by Al-Hasan Al-'Askari on the basis that he left no children to inherit.

The truth of the matter is that when the Shi'ites came to know that Al-Hasan Al-'Askari died leaving no male successor, and saw that this meant the end of the chain of Imamer succession, they realized that their sectarian school would cease to exist with the death of Al-Hasan Al-'Askari. They would no longer be Imamers because there was no Imam to succeed al-'Askari to the Imamate.

22 THE TALE OF THE DOOR AND THE TUNNEL

Upon this, one of them, Muhammad bin Nusair, a protege of the tribe of Numair, invented the idea that Al-Hasan had a son who was hidden in the tunnels of his father's residence. The impetus for such a fabrication came from his desire, and that of his accomplices, to deceive the Shi'ite public, especially the affluent among them, to collect zakaah⁽³⁷⁾ from them in the name of an existing Imam. They also wished to continue claiming that they were sincere Imamers. This Muhammad bin Nusair wanted himself to be the "door" to the imaginary tunnel between the invented Imam and his followers, in order to take charge of all zakaah funds. His accomplices disagreed with him in this plot and insisted on appointing as the "door" a grocer whose shop was adjacent to the entrance of Al-Hasan Al-'Askari's house. Hasan's father and family used to purchase from this grocer their household needs.

After this, Muhammad Nusair broke away from his former comrades and established the Nusairiyah sect, which takes its name and impetus from him⁽³⁸⁾. In the meantime, his former accomplices were devising a stratagem whereby they could bring forth their supposed Imam; they wanted him to marry and have sons who would succeed him to the office of the Imamate. This in turn would ensure that their Imamer sect would live on.

It became evident, however, that his appearance would be denied by the heads of the Alawi clans as well as their followers and their cousins, the Abbasid rulers and royalty. They therefore alleged that the Twelfth Imam remained in the tunnel; that his minor absence was followed by a major one; and so carried on with such fables as were never heard before, even among the ancient Greeks.

They expect all Muslims, whom Allah blessed with the grace of sound reason, to believe in such blatant lies in order that there may be a reconciliation between them and the Shi'ites. This preposterous idea could only be realized if the whole Islamic world were to turn into a Lunatic asylum. Praise be to Allah for the gift of reason, for indeed it is the faculty upon which the responsibility for one's actions depends. It is the most precious and sublime of graces after that of sound iman.

23 THE CONCEPT OF PLEDGING ALLEGIANCE ACCORDING TO THE MUSLIMS

Muslims entrust the position of leadership and the government to any mu'min (believer) with correct iman.--Thus they would pledge allegiance to all pious members of Ahlil-Bait, without any restriction as to their number or persons. Amongst the foremost of the believers to whom they would entrust the reins of leadership were the ten Companions who were given the glad tidings of their abode in Paradise. If there were no other factor by reason of which the Shi'ites acquired the designation of kaafirs (disbelievers), then their contradiction and denial of the Prophet's designation of those ten Companions as inhabitants of Paradise would have sufficed. ⁽³⁹⁾

The Muslims also would entrust the rest of the Companions with leadership, and would grant them full support and allegiance, for it was these noble personages upon whose shoulders was erected Islam and the Islamic world, and truth and goodness sprang forth from the soil of the Islamic nation which had been nourished by their precious blood. These are the Companions whom the Shi'ites claimed were enemies of `Ali and his sons, while actually they lived with `Ali as loving, cooperative brothers and died as such. What could be greater proof of this than the description Allah gives of them in Suratul Fath, from His book which falsehood cannot approach from before or behind He, the Almighty, said regarding the Companions, that they are "severe with the disbelievers, merciful amongst themselves." Allah also says about them, in Suratul Hadeed, "Unto Allah belongs the inheritance of the heavens and the earth. Those of your companions] who spent [For the sake of Allah] and fought [in His cause] before the Victory are not on the same level [as the rest of you. Such are greater in rank than those who spent and fought afterwards. Unto each Allah has promised good."

And does Allah ever break His promise? In Suratu Aali-Imraan Allah the Exalted referred to the Companions as `the best of peoples raised up for mankind", i.e., as an example to be followed.

24 Friendship And Affection Among The Rightly-Guided Caliphs

Due to the love and respect which the commander of the Faithful Ali bin Abi Taalib held for his three brethren caliphs, he named three of his sons after them. He also gave his eldest daughter Umm Kulthoom in marriage to `Umar Ibn-ul-Khattaab. In addition, we see that `Abdullah bin la'hr bin Abi Taalib, ('Ali's nephew) named one of his sons Abu Bakr, and the other one Mu'aawiyah. Mu'aawiyah bin `Abdullah named his son after Yazeed bin Mu'aawiyah bin Abu Sufyaan, who was considered to be of good repute, according to the testimony of Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyyah bin `Ali bin Abu Taalib.

25 Why We Must Rid Ourselves Of Any Connection With The Shi'ites

If the repudiation and denunciation which Shi'ites are now asking of us, as the price for reconciliation between us and them, includes those whom they have demanded it include (Abu Bakr, `Umar, etc.) then he whom they consider to be their first Imam, `Ali bin Abi Taalib, should be considered blameworthy by them, by virtue of his naming his sons after Abu Bakr, `Umar and `Uthman, and by his giving his daughters in marriage to `Umar and `Uthman. Furthermore, they must consider Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyyah a liar when he testified to the good character of Yazeed, if they accept the claim of `Abdullah bin Mutee, a supporter of Ibnuz-Zubair, that Yazeed drank liquor and neglected prayer, and exceeded the bounds established by Allah's Book. Muhammad bin Al-

Hanafiyyah defended Yazeed, saying have not witnessed what you mention. I visited him and stayed with him. He was regular in observing prayers and in performing good deeds, seeking religious knowledge and adhering to the sunnah." Ibn Mutee and those accompanying him replied that Yazeed's behavior was out of pretense in his presence. Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyyah rejoined: "What was it that he feared or hoped from me that he should appear before me in such a state of piety and humility?" He continued, "Did he confide in you that which you mention regarding his drinking of wine If he did so then you are his accomplices. And if he did not, then it is unlawful for you to bear witness to that of which you have no knowledge." They replied that although they did not see him drinking, yet "we believe that to be the truth." Muhammad's reply to them was that Allah rejects this kind of testimony from Muslims, for He says in His Book: "... except those who bear witness to the truth and with full knowledge."⁽⁴⁰⁾ Muhammad concluded, "Therefore, I have nothing to do with this affair..."⁽⁴¹⁾

Since the foregoing is what the son of `Ali bin Abi Taalib has testified to in favor of Yazeed bin Mu'aawiyah, then where does his fit in relation to the position the Shi'ites want us to adopt with them against Yazeed's father, Mu'aawiyah, and against those who are better than him and better than the whole creation⁽⁴²⁾, that is, Abu Bakr, `Umar, `Uthman, Talha, Az-Zubair, Amr ubn ul-Aws, along with the rest of the great Companions who memorized and preserved for us Allah's Book and the Sunnah of His Messenger, and who were the architects of the Islamic world.

The price demanded of us by the Shi'ites for a reconciliation with them is exorbitant. We lose everything by agreeing to it, while we gain nothing in return. It is only a fool who would deal with someone whom he knows would expect him to accept a losing bargain! The two concepts of walaayah (granting of allegiance) and baraa (repudiation and denunciation) upon which the Shi'ite religion is based, according to what has been affirmed by An-Naseer At-Toosi and confirmed by Ni'matullah Al-Moosawi and Al-Khuwansari, mean nothing except a complete alteration of the religion of Islam. This complete change would require of us enmity towards those upon whose shoulders was erected the very structure of Islam.

The Shi'ites have lied when they said that their sect is the only one to be granted salvation, the one whose condition and state differs from all of the rest, by virtue of which they alone would be saved.

The fact is that the impossibility of reconciliation between the Sunni sects on one side and Shi'ites on the other is due to the latter's disagreement with and contradiction of the rest of the Muslims in the very fundamentals of faith, as we have seen from the declarations of the Shi'ite scholars, and as can be seen from the beliefs and practices of every Shi'ite. This was the state of affairs in the past, and it is the state of affairs at the present time.

26 SHI'ITES PREFER PROPAGATION OF THEIR SECTARIAN TENETS TO TAQREEB

Without any doubt the Shi'ite Imams themselves do not want taqreeb, which is why they have made many sacrifices and suffered great pains in propagating the call for reconciliation and elimination of differences in our Sunni countries, while forbidding that such a call be raised, or allowed to proceed at all, in the Shi'ite countries. Nor do we see a hint of the influence of such a call on their educational institutions. In other words, the call to reconciliation has been restricted to one side, and as a result, every effort towards this cause will be futile, and a mere frivolous mockery, unless and until the Shi'ites categorically refrain from cursing and abusing Abu Bakr and `Umar; unless they cease repudiation and denunciation of anyone who was not, or is no presently, a Shi'ite partisan; and unless they rid themselves totally of their perverse concept of raising the pious Imams of the Prophet's family from the level of human beings to that of the gods of the pagan Greeks.

All of this is no less than an outrageous injustice against Islam and a diversion of it from the path and the goal to which it was directed by the Prophet to whom was entrusted the Islamic shari'ah (divinely revealed law), and by his noble Companions amongst whom were `Ali bin Abi Taalib and his offspring. If the Shi'ites do not totally abandon such an outrage against Islam and its articles of faith, and its history, then they are doomed to remain isolated from and rejected by all of the Muslims⁽⁴³⁾

27 THE INTRIGUE OF BAABISM AND BAHAIISM AND THE ENSUING UPHEAVAL IN IRAN

The upheaval of Baabism and its offshoot, Bahatism, struck Iran over a hundred years ago. Muhammad `Ali Ash-Shiraazi had begun by claiming that he was the Baab (precursor) to the awaited Mahdi. He later claimed that he himself was the [Mahdi](#), and in time he gained a sizable group of followers. The Iranian government chose to exile him to Azerbaijan, the home of Sunnis of the Hanafi school of jurisprudence. Being strict Sunnis, they were considered immune to the influence of such fabulous nonsense. It was, however, only logical to fear that Shi'ites would respond to Ash-Shiraazi's call, since his invention was derived from Shi'ism. For that reason, he was not exiled to a Shi'ite area, whose inhabitants would be only too willing to accept such fables. In spite of such precautions, a large number of Shi'ites became Ash-Shiraazi's followers, and thus there developed an ever-widening circle of commotion and disorder.

28 FROM SHI'ISM TO COMMUNISM

Just as the Shi'ite fables and myths were a factor in the appearance and spread of Babism and Bahatism in the past century. So now they can be seen to be a cause of the rejection of Shi'ism by some of the educated Shi'ite youth, in favour of communism. They have awakened to the realization that many Shi'ite beliefs are too ridiculous to be credible, and as a result they have utterly rejected them. Many were drawn to various communist organizations, with their energetic propagandists, books in various languages, and efficiently run centres. These young people were an easy prey, and fell readily into the trap. Had they known the religion of Islam in its original pure state, and acquired a proper knowledge of it, they would have been protected from such a fate. Instead, we find that communism has thrived, especially in Iran and in the Shi'ite areas of Iraq. More communists are to be found in those communities than can be found in any other Muslim community.

This concludes what circumstances have allowed me to present by way of fulfilling the covenant which Allah has taken from the Muslims, by which we pledge to give good counsel and a word of caution to all Muslims, solely for the sake of Allah.

Allah protects and preserves His religion, His nation of believers, and our great Islamic identity and existence.

Footnotes:

1. Related by Abu Dawood and others with an authentic chain of narrators.
2. The invocation is called Du'aa Sanamay Quraish the invocation against the two idols of Quraish, by which the Shi'ites mean the two caliphs of Allah's Messenger, Abu Bakr and `Umar!.
3. Khomeini, Al-Hukoomat ul-Islamiyyah, pp. 52-53.
4. What Khomeini means here, is that he not only affirms and believes all that is in the Shi'ite book Al-Kaafi, but he also sees it as obligatory to adhere to it and put its rulings and directives into effect in the Shi'ite state.
5. The two terms `Ahlus-Sunnah (Sunnis) and `Shi'ah" (Shi'ites) need to be defined at this point. Ahlus-Sunnah means literally "people of the established way or path". It refers to the majority of Muslims, who follow the sunnah (way) of Muhammad, the Messenger of Allah, the Almighty. The term Shi'ah is from the phrase shi'atul `Ali (adherents to or company of `Ali), by which this sect is known for reason of its attachment to the idea of the pre-eminence of `Ali ibni Abi Taalib and his descendants.

6. The author's reference to Azhar University's being in the beginning stage of its "mission" requires some comment, as this treatise was written over thirty years ago. Since that time, Al-Azhar has incorporated the study of the Shi'ite "Twelve Imams" school as a required part of its curriculum in Islamic Studies. This, along with its call for reconciliation of the various sects and schools of thought, might create the impression of acceptance of the misguided sects such as the Shi'ite Twelve Imams and the Ismailis. In fact, the only legitimate reason for studying such sects and movements is the hope that such a study will bring to light their real natures, and that consequently, their false doctrines and perverse ideology may be refuted by reference to the authentic sources of Islam, the Holy Qur'an, the authentic Sunnah, and the example of the Companions of the Prophet (Allah's blessings and peace be upon him).

7. This kind of "favoritism" has been repeated throughout different eras. It was due to the sending of propagandists claiming such lofty goals of reconciliation that Iraq was converted from a Sunni country containing a Shi'ite minority to a state which is predominantly Shi'ite.

8. "Wali" has several meanings, the relevant ones in this context being "the closest friend and associate" and "the one upon whom has been conferred legal authority to rule; vicegerent". The person intended by this term in the quoted passage is obviously `Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), the Prophet's cousin and the fourth caliph. By forging such a verse the Shi'ite are attempting to give credence to their perverse view that the only legal caliph was `Ali and that the right to the caliphate belongs to Ahlil-Bait (the members of the Prophet's family) alone. This they tried to do by claiming divine revelation as a source of this belief of theirs, so it was expedient to forge a Qur'anic verse, in order to support their false position.

9. Noeldeke, History of Copies of the Qur'an, Vol. 2, p. 102.

10. Zanaadiq is the plural of zindeeq, a Persian word meaning one who speaks heresy, or who has deviated from the truth. It is also applied to disbelievers or atheists or free-thinkers. (cf., Lisanul-Arab Vol. 10. p. 147).

11. The meaning of this statement, allegedly made by 'Ali in the course of an argument with an unnamed zindeeq, is obscure, to say the least. We may surmise from the context that a discussion or dispute had been taking place between them, 'Ali having been attacked in repudiation of his supposed insistence that he possessed that missing one third of the Qur'an, which according to Shi'ite belief was deleted by the Companions of the Prophet. This is a concoction of the Shi'ites, falsely attributed to 'Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), in order to bolster their attempt to prove the alteration of the Qur'an. As for the verse cited as proof of deletion from the Qur'an, there is unanimous agreement among the Sunni commentators on the Qur'an that, after a careful analysis of the structure of the verse and its context, it may be paraphrased as follows: "If any of you has an orphan girl under his guardianship and he fears that he may not do her justice by granting her an appropriate dowry if he were to marry her, then let him marry other women of his choice." For further details see Ibn Katheer Tafseerul Qur'an al-'Adheem. Vol. 1, p. 449.

12. By the 'hypocrites', Abu Mansoor At-Tabarsi means the Companions of Allah's Messenger (Allah's blessing and peace be upon him), for it was they who collected the Qur'an, the 'Uthmani version which was adhered to and applied by 'Ali during the period of his caliphate. If the statement attributed to 'Ali in At-Tabarsi's Al-Ihtijaaj had really come from him, it would have been treachery against Islam on his part, to possess and conceal some missing portion of the Qur'an and not make it public, nor apply its principles, nor, circulate it amongst his subjects during the period of his caliphate. Clearly At-Tabarsi has insulted and defamed 'Ali, since what he has written actually implies treachery and deception on 'Ali's part.

13. Muhammad Mahdi Al-Asfahani Al-Kaathini, Ahsanul-Wadee'ah, Vol 2, p. 90.

14. Al-Kulaini, Al-Kaafi, 1278 A.H., p. 54

15. Al Azhar Maazine, 1372 A.H., p. 307.

16. Al-Kulaini, Al-Kaafi, 1278 A.H., p. 75

17. Al-Hazarn, Al Fisal fil Millal wan-Niha1, Vol. 2, p. 78 and Vol. 4, p. 182.

18. Jibt means an idol or a sorcerer, or one who claims to tell the future. Taaghoot is a name applied to any object or person worshipped apart from the one God, Allah.

19. Al-Mamqaani, lanqeehul-Maqaal fee Ahwaalir-Rijaal, 1352 A.H.,Vo. 1,p207.

20. The day of 'Ashooraa is the tenth day of Muharram of the Muslim lunar calendar. and it has Great significance for the Shi'ites. It is the culmination of long days of bitter grieving and vicious self-inflicted pain which they observe annually in commemoration of he death of Imam Hussain, the grandson of the Prophet (ﷺ). who was martyred at Karbala in Iraq.

21. One naturally questions here why his grandfather 'Ali bin Abi Taalib did not do just that during the period of his rule. Is his twelfth generation descendant more sincere than 'Ali in his service of the Qur'an and Islam?

22. Bai'at ur-Ridwaan is the pledge of allegiance and support by the Companions to the Prophet, with which Allah was well pleased, as is clearly indicated by the verse revealed regarding it. The pledge was given to the Prophet by a group of approximately fourteen hundred Companions (amongst them Abu Bakr and 'Umar) who had headed out with him towards the Holy City of Mecca, unarmed and intending to perform the rites of the minor pilgrimage to Allah's sacred house, the Ka'bah, in the sixth year of the Hijrah (emigration of the Prophet and his Companions from Mecca to Medina). When they arrived at Hudaibia, a small village near Mecca, the tribe of Quraish forbade them entrance to the city and news spread that they had slain the emissary the Holy Prophet had sent to them. Upon this the Prophet (may Allah's peace and blessings be upon him) took the pledge of allegiance to his cause and for the defense of Islam against the disbelievers in case war should have to be resorted to. See t-Tabari's Tareekhur-Rasul wal-Mulook, Vol.

4, pp. 72-81.

23. Qur'an, 48:18.

24. Al-Khaalisi has somehow reasoned that by using the word "believers" in this verse, Allah is implying that some of those who swore allegiance were not believers. Al- Khaalisi concludes from this that the Sunnis are mistaken in using this verse to prove that all those who gave the pledge were believers, and that Allah was pleased with them. In fact, the only way Al-Khaalisi's interpretation would be credible is if the text read: "... Allah was pleased with the believers among them, when they swore allegiance to you..."

25. Al-Kulaini, Al-Kaafi,

26. Ibid

27. Ibid

28. Ibid

29. Ibid

30. Ibid

31. Ibid

32. Ibid

33. The Mu'tazilaite sect introduced speculative dogmatics into Islam

34. The concept of the Muslim nation separating into seventy-three sects, is taken from authentic traditions such as the following related by Abu Huraira (may Allah be pleased with him): "The Messenger of Allah said: 'The Jews separated into seventy-one sects, and the Christians into seventy-two, and my nation will divide into seventy-three sects.'" This was recorded in the compilations of Abi-Dawood, Al-Tirmidhi, Ibn Majah and others, with an authentic chain of transmitters. There is also narrated, in the compilations of Abi Dawood, Ad-Darimi, Ahmad and others the statement: "Seventy-two [of the seventy-three sects of the Muslim nation] will be in the fire, and one only will be in Paradise; it is the Jama'ah [i.e. Ahlus-Sunnah wal Jama'ah]." In yet another narration the, final statement is: "All of these [sects] will be in the fire except one; it is the Jama'ah." Finally, there is another narration which states: "The Companions asked: 'Which sect will triumph [i.e., achieve salvation]?' The Prophet replied: 'The sect which adheres to that [set of beliefs and practices] which I and my Companions adhere to.'" It should be clear from these traditions that the one sect, out of the seventy-three, which is to gain salvation, is the Ahlus-Sunnah, the only segment of the Muslim community which strictly adheres to that which the Holy Prophet and his noble Companions adhered to.

35. The name "Rawaafid" (Rafidites, Rafida) is applied generally, to all the various sects of the Shi'ites, the first of which appeared during 'Ali's time. Among them are the A-Saba'eeah who told 'Ali that he was God, as a result of which he ordered them to be burned to death. Others followed, amongst them the Zaidiah, the Imamiah, and the Keesaaniah. They differ from each other greatly and often we find one denying the iman of the other. The term rawaafid means literally rejectors, and was first used when the followers of Zaid son of 'Ali Zain-ul-'Abideen, the son of Al-Husain son of 'Ali bin Abi Taalib, demanded that he disown the two caliphs Abu Bakr and 'Umar. Upon hearing their demand Zaid said: "They were both ministers of my grandfather of the Prophet Muhammad], therefore I will not disown them." Hearing this, the followers of Zaid rejected him and parted from him, hence the name Rawaafid (rejectors). It later came to denote all the Shi'ah, who claimed to be partisans of the family of the Prophet Muhammad (Allah's blessings and peace be upon him).

36. The two shahaadas are the two testifications of faith which are as follows: "I bear witness that there is no god but Allah and I bear witness that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah."

37. Zakaah is the obligatory alms-tax assessed on accumulated wealth, and distributed among the poor.

38. The Nusairis (also known as 'Alawis) are a Shi'ite sect that has a particularly fanatic devotion to 'Ali (may Allah be pleased with him). They hold that Allah appears in the form of certain persons on the earth, and since there were no persons after the Prophet of Allah better than 'Ali and his sons, Allah manifested Himself in them and spoke with their tongues.

39. Abdul Qaahir Al-Baghdaadi states the Sunni position in Al-Farqu bainal-Firaq: "They unanimously agreed that the ruling of disbelief must be made regarding a person who has called a kaafir any of the ten Companions whom the Prophet (may Allah's blessings and peace be upon him) testified would be among the inhabitants of Paradise." He also said that it is waajib (compulsory) to give a verdict of kufr (heretical disbelief) in the case of anyone who considers any of the Companions to be disbelievers.

40. Qur'an 43:86

41. Ibn Katheer. Al-Bidaayah wan-Nihaayah Vol. 8. p. 233

42. The Companions of Muhammad are considered the best of creation after the Prophets and Messengers of Allah.

43. It is a Shi'ite tradition that Taqiyyah is my faith and the faith of my forefathers. They also say that whosoever does not practice taqiyyah. he has no faith. ' Further. it is mentioned in Al-Islamu Sabeelus-sa'aadah was-salaam that "If a person expected harm to befall him or his wealth in the

general public order. it is incumbent upon him to abandon the order of enjoining the good and forbidding the evil. This ruling is one of the peculiarities specific to the Shi'ites, and is called at-taqiyyah." Clearly, if this were to be followed to the letter, even Jihad (holy struggle for the sake of Allah) could be abandoned. and this would be definitely in contradiction to the command of Allah the Exalted.

The Shi'ah As Mentioned In The Quran

The word Shia, Shiah, Shiite, or Shi'ah was used many times in the Holy Quran. It means sect or band but it mostly has a negative meaning. Let's see:

إن الذين فرقوا دينهم وكانوا شيعاً لست منهم في شيء إنما أمرهم إلى الله ثم ينبئهم بما كانوا يفعلون

"As for those who divide their religion and break up into sects (Shiites), you have no part in them in the least: their affair is with Allah: He will in the end tell them the truth of all that they did." (6:159)

In this verse, God warns us not to divide ourselves into Shiites and declare people who do so as people who don't belong to the prophet Muhammad (p).

قل هو القادر على أن يبعث عليكم عذاباً من فوقكم أو من تحت أرجلكم أو يلبسكم شيعاً ويذيق بعضكم بأس بعض انظر كيف نصرف الآيات لعلهم يفقهون

"Say: "He has power to send calamities on you, from above and below, or to cover you with confusion in party strife (make you Shiites), giving you a taste of mutual vengeance - each from the other." See how We explain the Signs by various (symbols); that they may understand." (6:65)

In this verse, God warns us that he can let us become Shiites as a great punishment to us.

منيبين إليه واتقوه وأقيموا الصلاة ولا تكونوا من المشركين ❁
من الذين فرقوا دينهم وكانوا شيعاً كل حزب بما لديهم فرحون

"Turn you in repentance to Him, and fear Him: establish regular prayers, and be not you among those who join gods with Allah, those who splite up their religion, and become (mere) Sects (Shiites), each party rejoicing in that which is with itself!" (30:31-32)

In this verse, God associates the word Shiites with polytheist pagans who join gods with Allah!

ثُمَّ لَنُنزِعَنَّ مِنْ كُلِّ شَيْعَةٍ أَهْمَ أَشَدُّ عَلَى الرَّحْمَنِ عِتِيًّا

"Then shall We certainly drag out from every sect (Shiites) all those who were worst in obstinate rebellion against (Allah) Most Gracious." (Qur'an Mariam: 69)

In this verse, God associates the word Shiites with those who are worst in obstinate rebellion against Him.

رَعُونَ عَلَايَةَ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَجَعَلَ أَهْلَهَا شِيَعًا يَسْتَضَعِفُ طَائِفَةٌ مِنْهُمْ يُذِخْ أَبْنَاءَهُمْ وَيَسْتَحْيِي نِسَاءَهُمْ إِنَّهُ كَانَ مِنَ الْمُفْسِدِينَ

"Truly Pharaoh elated himself in the land and broke up its people into sections (Shiites), depressing a small group among them: their sons he slew, but he kept alive their females: for he was indeed a maker of mischief." (28:4)

As far as Pharaoh is concerned, he proclaimed himself to be god. He divided his people into groups and parties so that he will be able to rule them easily. Each group is called Shi'ah.

The Views Of Ahlus-Sunnah Towards The Sahaba

One of the fundamental beliefs of Ahlus Sunnah wal Jama`ah that at times distinguishes them from heretics is their belief in the Companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) and all that has been mentioned about their virtues, merits and characteristics in the Qur'an and Sunnah.

Companions are all those who met the Prophet (ﷺ) and died as Muslims. Scholars have said that they were 114,000 in number [as stated by Abu Zur'ah, the teacher of Imam Muslim, and recorded by as-Suyootee]. They are praised in many Qur'anic verses:

"You are the best of peoples ever raised for mankind, you enjoin good and forbid evil, and you believe in Allah." [3:110]

"And the first to embrace Islam of the Muhajiroon (the Emigrants from Makkah) and the Ansar (the citizens of Al-Madeenah who helped the Muhajiroon) and also those who followed them exactly (in Faith). Allah is well-pleased with them as they are well pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow, to dwell therein forever. That is the supreme success." [9:100]

"Indeed, Allah was pleased with the believers when they gave their pledge to you (O Muhammad) under the tree. He knew what was in their hearts and He sent down calmness and tranquility upon them..." [48:18]

Our Attitude Towards Them

Our attitude towards the Sahaba should be that of love, respect, peace and purity of our hearts and tongues. Allah has described this in His saying:

"And those who come after them say: 'Our Lord! Forgive us and our brethren who have preceded us in Faith, and put not in our hearts any hatred against those who have believed.'" [59:10]

And the Prophet (ﷺ) said, "**The sign of faith is love of the Ansar and the sign of hypocrisy is the hatred of Ansar**" [al-Bukharee, Muslim].

Why should we not be thankful to those who believed in the Prophet, assisted him, strove with their lives and wealth to make the Word of Allah supreme, preserved and transmitted to us our Religion? Who is more deserving that we pray for them and speak of them in the best manner and think of them with the best thoughts?

We should therefore mention their virtues and remain silent about any mistakes they made and about anything that occurred between them, as the Prophet (ﷺ) advised us:

"When my Companions are mentioned then withhold" [Saheeh, at-Tabaraneeh].

And he also said, "**Do not abuse my Companions, for if any of you were to spend gold equal to (mountain of) Uhud in charity, it would not equal a handful of one of them or even half of that**" [al-Bukharee, Muslim].

And he said, **"Whoever abuses my Companions, upon them is the curse of Allah, the angels and all the people"** [Saheeh, At-Tabaraneh].

Muslim scholars have also been very strict in regard to the issue of speaking and thinking mistrustfully of the Sahaba. Imam Malik said that someone who finds in himself an ill-feeling or anger "ghaiDH" about the Companions is a kafir because Allah (s.w.t.) says **"li-yagheedHa bihim ul kuffar"** - that He may enrage the disbelievers with them, i.e. the Sahaba [48:29]. And the `Ulama' also say if the Companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) were disbelievers, dishonest or betrayed the Prophet, then the whole religion would be undermined. Because how do we know what the Prophet (ﷺ) said, if the Companions of the Prophet (ﷺ) were not honest and truthful? We cannot be sure. And this also applies to the Qur'an, as we received the Qur'an through the Sahaba as well. Indeed, they were truthful and sincere, as Allah described them:

"Among the believers are men who have been true to their covenant with Allah and showed not their backs to the disbelievers, of them some have fulfilled their obligations and some of them are still waiting, but they never changed (i.e. they never proved treacherous to their covenant which they concluded with Allah) in the least." [33:23]

Hujjat ul Islam, Sufyan ibn `Uyainah said: "He who speaks a single word against the Companions of Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) then he is an innovator." And Imam Ahmad said: "If you see anyone speaking ill of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, doubt his Islam." And Adh-Dhahabee said, "Anyone who criticizes them or insults them has gone out of this religion and has segregated himself from the Muslim Ummah. He has disbelieved in what Allah the Most High says concerning them in His Book, and what Allah's Messenger has said concerning their noble qualities and their merits... It is incumbent upon the Muslims to love Allah; to love His Messenger, to love what the Prophet brought as guidance and as his practise; to love his descendants, his Companions, his wives, his children, his servants, and to love those who love them and hate those who hate them, as this is the meaning of loving for Allah's sake and hating for Allah's sake, and that is the most excellent kind of faith." In al-Kaba'ir (The Greatest Sins), we find that adh-Dhahabee also said, "The one who loves the Prophet loves and respects each and all of his Companions. To hate any of them is to hate the Prophet." Al-Fudayl ibn `Iyyad spoke similarly when he said, "Indeed, I love those whom Allah loves. They are those from whom the Companions of Muhammad (ﷺ) are safe. I hate those whom Allah hates. They are the people of the deviant sects and innovation."

These statements of the great Imams of the Ummah should not surprise us, because a slight doubt about the Companions will in fact be accusing the Prophet himself of hiding the truth about them which he knew (that they were hypocrites, as heretics claim), but he did not tell us!! Or one is accusing him (ﷺ) of being something like an imbecile, as Shaikh Ja'far Idris once spoke, because the Prophet, supposedly did not know although he lived with these people all the time. He thought that they were the best Muslims, but they were hypocrites, (the heretics say). That is why al-Barbaharee said, "Know that anyone who tries to attack the Companions of Muhammad (ﷺ) really seeks to attack Muhammad (ﷺ)."

The Best Of The Companions

We should note that the best of the Ummah, after the Prophet (ﷺ) were Abu Bakr, then 'Umar, then 'Uthman, then 'Ali. As far as the Caliphate is concerned, Ibn Taymeeyah has said that anyone who "objects against anyone of these regarding this order of caliphate, he will be regarded more misguided than the domestic donkey."

And `Abdul-`Azeez al-Qari said that Abu Haneefa "declared anyone who doubts the caliphate of Abu Bakr and 'Umar is a disbeliever. He also declared anyone who slanders the Mother of the Believers 'A'isha to be a disbeliever. And he stated that the prayer behind a Rafidhee [extreme Shee'ah who curse and abuse the Companions] is invalid."

Ahlu Sunnah also, "accept all the superiorities and grades that have been described about them in the Qur'an, the Hadith and by consensus. They give superiority to those who spent and fought for the sake of Allah before the victory, that is, truce of Hudaibiyah over those who spent and fought after that. They consider al-Muhajireen (those who migrated from Makkah to al-Madeenah for Islam) to be superior to al-Ansar (the helpers of al-Madeenah who supported the Muhajireen). They have faith in what Allah has said about the 313 persons on the occasion of the battle of Badr that, **'they are free to do what they like, their sins are pardoned'** [al- Bukharee]. And none of those who gave their pledge to the Prophet (ﷺ) under the tree will get into Fire as the Prophet (ﷺ) has stated, **'Allah is doubtlessly pleased with them and they are pleased with Allah.'** And they were more than 1400 about whom the Prophet (ﷺ) bore witness that they will be admitted to Paradise [Muslim]. The Ahlu Sunnah also bear witness the admission to Paradise for them such as the ten Companions who have been given glad tidings of Paradise in this world by the Prophet." [Al-aaqeedatul Wasitiyyah of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymeeyah]

The Companions' Noble Deeds

We believe that the Sahaba were not innocent of the minor or major sins, but their qualities and deeds were so virtuous and superior that they cause the pardon of the errors committed by them. We believe that if any of the Sahaba committed a mistake, he either repented or performed such virtuous deeds that they are either pardoned or will be interceded for by the Prophet (ﷺ) as they are most deserving of his intercession. Their Jihad, Hijra, knowledge, deeds and support for the Prophet (ﷺ) will be a cause of pardon of their few mistakes. As for their Ijtihad, they are rewarded twice when they were correct, and once when their exertion to find the truth resulted in a wrong conclusion. And, as ash-Shafi'ee said, "I have allegiance for them and I seek Allah's forgiveness for them, and for the people of Camel and Siffeen, those who killed and those who were killed, and all the companions of the Prophet in entirety."

The deeds and virtues of the Sahaba, may Allah be pleased with them all, should be what every Muslim should strive to emulate to the best of one's ability. Their behaviour and sincerity were praised by Allah and His Messenger (ﷺ) and that suffices as proof.

As Ibn Mas'ood said, "Indeed Allah looked into the hearts of the servants and found the heart of Muhammad (ﷺ) to be the best of the hearts of His servants and so He chose him for Himself and sent him as a Messenger. Then He looked into the hearts of His servants after Muhammad (ﷺ) and found the hearts of the Companions to be the best of the hearts of the servants. So He made them ministers of His Messenger (ﷺ) fighting for His Deen. So whatever the Muslims hold to be good then it is good with Allah and whatever the Muslims hold to be evil it is evil with Allah." [Ahmad, at-Tayalasee]

The Sahaba were undoubtedly the best in terms of understanding the religious obligations, the Sunnah of the Prophet and the way of establishing the Islamic teachings. Their belief is an example for us, as Allah says in the Qur'an: "So if they believe in the like of that which you believe, they are rightly guided, but if they turn away, then they are only in opposition. So Allah will suffice you against them. And He is the All-Hearer, the All-Knower." [2:137]

The Best Of People

And they are the best people, to which the Prophet (ﷺ) referred to in the Hadith: "**The best of my people are my generation then those who come after them, then those who come after them, then there will come a people in whom there will be no good.**" [At-Tabarane, authenticated by al-Albanee]

Also, in al-Bukharee, "**The best of the people are my generation, then those after them, then those after them...**" This is also reported by Muslim, Abu Dawood, at-Tirmidhee, An-Nasa'ee and others.

The Prophet (ﷺ) also said, "**...and my Ummah will divide into seventy-three sects.**" [Abu Dawood, at-Tirmidhee, Ibn Majah, al-Hakim, Ahmad, authenticated by at-Tirmidhee, al Hakim, ibn Taymeeyah, as-Suyootee, al-Manawee, ash-Shatibee, adh-Dhahabee and al-Albanee].

In another Hadith that is hasan, the Prophet (ﷺ) explained which one is the saved sect: "**Al-Jama'ah**" [Ibn Majah]. In another Hasan Hadith the Prophet (ﷺ) said, "**The tribes of Israel broke into seventy- two sects. My Ummah shall break up into seventy-three sects. All of them will be in the Fire, except one: the one on which I am upon, and my Companions.**" [At-Tirmidhee]

Following Their Footsteps

All this should suffice as evidence that the correct understanding of Islam is that of the first three generations and all those that follow their path, in truth. There is no disagreement among Muslim scholars that the best generations of Islam are to be followed, that the interpretation of the Qur'an and Sunnah they agreed upon is regarded as the correct one, and that we are to approach the Deen in the manner they approached it. We are obliged to follow them, and that means, first and foremost, to have the same creed as they did, no deviations, no additions and no deletions.

We also have to approach `ibadah ([worship in obedience to Allah](#)) in the same way, no innovations, no additions and no deletions. We take all of the Sunnah and refer all disagreements to Allah and His Messenger, as Allah (s.w.t.) commanded us in the Qur'an [4:59].

To follow the Sahaba does not only mean to have the same understanding of the precepts of belief as they did. That belief must be manifested in our actions and to follow the Sahaba also means to possess their other characteristics, some of which have been identified by our scholars as:

- | The full acceptance of the Revelation
- | The deep influence of the faith and the revelation on one's life
- | The application of this knowledge to the individual and collective life
- | Inviting others to do good deeds
- | Enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong
- | Giving advice to every Muslim
- | Practicing Jihad for the Sake of Allah

Also, the Sahaba presented every action according to the scales of the Sharee`ah, they used to remember and think a lot about death, they were forgiving to those who wronged them in any way, they had a great respect for the honour of other Muslims, for whom they desired only good, they were mindful of their prayers, they used to put the Hereafter before this Dunya, they realized that they could not thank Allah enough and they stayed away from the sinful and their gatherings. Allah, The Exalted, most appropriately describes them:

["Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, and those who are with him \(the Companions\) are](#)

severe against disbelievers, and merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and falling down prostrate **(in prayer)**, seeking Bounty from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure. The mark of them **(i.e. of their faith)** is on their faces **(foreheads)** from the traces of **(their) prostration (during prayers)**." [48:29]

We ask Allah to enable us to learn about the lives of the Sahaba and to make our lives resemble theirs. For, as Ibn Taymeeyah said, "Whoever will read their biographies with understanding and insight, and will come to know the rewards bestowed by Allah upon them, he will certainly realise that these are the best among humans after the Prophets. Neither there has been anyone like them nor will there be."

Can You, Shia, Answer These Questions?

Al-Hassan bin Ali relinquished for Mu'awiya and made peace with him, that happened at a time where he had enough armies and allies which would allowed him to continued fighting. Al-Hussain bin Ali came out to war despite the small number of his followers at a time when he could have made peace. This tells us that one of them was right and the other was wrong because:

If Al-Hassan's concession with the ability to fight was right, then Al-Hussain's war with lack of means was *wrong*.

If Al-Hussain's war with lack of means was right, then Al-Hassan's concession with the ability to fight was *wrong*.

And this puts you in a place where no one can envy you. Because if you say that both of them are right, you agree to two opposite things and this destroys your roots and logic.

So if you say that Al-Hussain's action was wrong then you have to believe in the falsehood of his leadership "Imamah" and the falsehood of the leadership of his father and his infallibility. Because he was given a trust and the infallible leader does not give the trust to anyone but an infallible like him. And if you say that Al-Hassan's action was wrong then you have to believe in the falsehood of his leadership "Imamah" and the falsehood of the leadership of his children and progeny because he is the root of their leadership and through him came the leadership. And if the root is wrong, then the branches are all wrong.

And we say to every Shia:

Regardless of what you answer to this conundrum, your answer is not convincing for this reason:

You would believe that Ali accepted to himself what the low Bedouins of the Arabs would not accept for themselves and he is from the Prophet's family? And I repeat the question to you, if Umar's shortcomings are like what you describe then how would Ali accept him as a husband to his daughter? So do the Shia put Ali in a class that's *lower than the Bedouins* (since Bedouins won't accept this shame for themselves)? And would Al-Hussain accept this? Or would Al-Hasan accept this?

And if you accept that, then they are less class than the Bedouin of Arabs! and that is not acceptable to us. The issue is that you make up accusations against Umar bin Al-Khattab and then you want us to accept an excuse which is worse than the sin itself. And your excuse is Taqiyya. So was it for Taqiyya that Ali married his daughter off to Umar? You curse Umar, make up bad things about him, and allege that he was an apostate, then after all that you want to claim that Ali was a coward too? This is not acceptable to us for Umar nor for Ali. And if Umar in your opinion is an Infidel and you claim that Ali knew that, then why did he marry him off to his daughter?!

The whole thing is illogical completely. If the Sahaba (companions of the Prophet) were really apostates, as you claim, then did Ali use Taqiyyah instead of fighting them? If using Taqiyyah is the right thing to do, then why did Ali fight the infidels during the time of the Prophet instead of using Taqiyyah to end the matter? If the Kuffar's land was a land of war (Dar Harb), then the Muslim land - under Abu Bakr and Umar- is for sure a land of war as well. In the land of the Kuffar, the infidels used to be fought and calls for war were called. And in the Muslim land under Abu Bakr and Umar, as you claim it to be a land of war, you consider the Rightly Guided Khalifas infidels just like you consider Yazeed and even worse. Don't you consider them Murtadeen (apostates)? Then what is

Ali's duty? To get along with this one and be submissive to others? Would the Imam Ali submit to an infidel (as you claim) who took the mother of Mohammad bin Al-Hanafiyah (the son of Imam Ali bin Abi Talib) as a woman prisoner during the time of Abu Bakr (who in your opinion is an unfair oppressor)? According to Shia Fiqh, everything that an oppressor does and all his rulings are invalid. So why did Imam Ali take that woman and have a child from her? This is an insult to the Imam from your side.

If you compare Ali with Ammar, then you should remember that Ali's class is much higher than Ammar's since Ali's position to the Prophet was like the status of Haroon to Musa, isn't that what you say? Then how do you compare this to that? And despite all that, it was an exception for Ammar to be used only in times of necessity. But for you, it is a religion and a creed. It is a profession rather than a hobby. Doesn't one of your sayings say "[Taqiyya is my religion and the religion of my fathers and grandfathers](#)"? Then it is a religion and not an exception. It is a creed and a root and not a special case. So would Ali submit to the infidels? and would he marry his daughter off to an infidel? and would Ali accept to himself what the lowest of Arabs would **never** accept? And is there an insult worse than submitting to the infidels? And is there is any more humiliation than marrying his daughter off to a pervert who allegedly hit and caused his wife, Fatimah, to miscarry? Wouldn't you declare war against him? And you also claim that Umar used to drink Alcohol? And you curse him and accuse him of more insults than that but you still expect Ali to submit to him?

Then why did Imam Ali go to war against the Kuffar if he was going to submit to the alleged apostates? Then who is supposed to fight against the oppressors and the apostates? And you say that Ammar was given an excuse by the messenger? There were no Ayahs from the Quran about Ammar's leadership as you claim for Ali. And he will not be considered an Imam by you at any case. And he does not carry a responsibility like the responsibility of Ali as you say. This is because Ammar was led but did not lead. And Ali lead, but you claim that he cannot be lead. He was a leader, not a follower. However, he submitted once to Abu Bakr, once to Umar, and once to Uthman and they were all apostates as you claim! Your Taqiyya is a rubber that extends here and shrinks there! You give it to Ammar when he was under torture while it was an exception for one time only. And for Imam Ali, the free man and the brave war hero, you used it to justify his submission to Abu Bakr and then his submission to Umar. Then you used it again to explain his submission to Uthman. Then once again, it was used as a justification for him marrying his daughter Umm Kulthoom to Umar. And again it was used to justify Ali taking Umm Mohammad bin Al-Hanafyeh even though she was a war prisoner and the ruler was an oppressor. This is not allowed in Shia Jurisprudence at all. So it is actually an admittance of the leadership of Abu Bakr. Then what was Ali's duty in the first place if he did not fight oppression and injustice? This is basically the truth of your words.

Shia References:

- 1- Ya'qooby's History, Volume 2, page 149-150
- 2- Al-Forroh min Al-Kafy, the book of Al-Nikah, Chapter of The Marriage of Umm Kulthoom. Volume 5, Page 346.
- 3- Tahzeeb Al-Ahkam, the book of inheritance, the chapter of inheritance from the drowned and the ones who die under collapsed buildings. Volume 9, Page 115-116.
- 4- Al-Shafi by Mr. Murtada Alam Al-Huda, Page 116 and his book "Tanzeeh Al-Anbya" page 141, Tahrn Issue.
- 5- Ibn Shaheer Ashob in his book "Manaqeb Aal Ali bin Abi Talib" volume 3 page 162.
- 6- Ibn Aby Al-Hadeed in his commentary on "Nahj Albalagha" volume 3 page 124

The Marriage Of Umm Kulthoom, Daughter Of 'Ali, To 'Umar Bin Al- Khattab

MISREPRESENTATION OF HISTORY

A major part of the edifice upon which Shi'ism has constructed itself is its idiosyncratic portrayal of the early history of Islam. It is especially in its representation of the relationships that existed between 'Ali ibn Abi Talib t and the eminent Sahabah like Abu Bakr t and Umar t that Shi'ism has acquired a character of its own.

Shi'i historians seemed little troubled by the fact that their own reconstruction of history would inevitably involve the invention of events, or versions of actual events, that would be at variance with standard sources. They seem to have been considerably confident that the emotional appeal of their version of history would override, and indeed obviate the need for a critical comparison of their narratives with those of other historians of repute. Their confidence appears to have been well founded, for a millennium has passed and still there is evidence in abundance of an emphatically emotional and sentimental approach to issues whose historicity needed to have been critically scrutinised in a spirit of emotional detachment. In this belated century that prides itself on the advancement of research methodology and techniques, the anomaly of a methodology that has emotive appeal as its central component stands out like a very sore thumb.

It is this spirit—of emotional prejudice overriding objective scholarship—that Shi'i propagandists up to this very day insist on "revealing" to their Sunni audiences the "truth" about the "persecution" suffered by the Ahl al-Bayt y at the hands of the Sahabah y . They can often be found launching into their particular misrepresentations of history, with no respect for standards of historic authenticity, and even less in awe of the way in which they are in actual fact bringing disgrace upon the Family of Rasulullah r . Their audiences too, are just as often completely captivated by these "revelations". The last thing on the mind of both propagandist and audience is the grievous contradictions the writer or speaker makes himself guilty of in his emotionally laden corruption of history.

"PERSECUTION" OF THE AHL AL-BAYT

One such case of the invention of history is the "persecution" mentioned by Shi'i reporters of history to have been meted out to 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and his wife Sayyidah Fatimah immediately after the demise of Rasulullah r . The incidents as mentioned by these unscrupulous narrators—

of 'Umar ibn al-Khattab threatening to burn down the house of Fatimah with her and her family inside

of 'Umar ordering the door of the house to be broken, with Fatimah being wounded and losing her unborn child in the process, and six months later dying from that same injury

and of her husband, the valiant 'Ali being dragged out of his house like a common criminal to give his oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr

all of these have to the Shi'i mind become undisputable and incontestible facts of history, no matter how spurious their origin, or how blatantly they clash with authentic historical facts. Abu Bakr and 'Umar will ever be thought of by the Shi'ah in terms of the "deeds" of that day, and no true Shi'i who believes in these stories as factual truth could ever be expected to harbour the merest ounce of

goodwill towards Abu Bakr and 'Umar—let alone the rest of the Sahabah who stood with them and paid allegiance to them.

However, let us take this version of history that weaves itself around the core element of persecution, and its concomitant of mutual hatred between 'Ali ibn Abi Talib and the rest of the Sahabah, and let us compare it with some other facts, the historic authenticity of which is accepted by both Ahl as-Sunnah and Shi'ah. For example, the fact that 'Ali ibn Abi Talib himself names three of his sons Abu Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthman. (See al-Shaykh al-Mufid, [Kitab al-Irshad](#), pp. 268-269, where these three sons of 'Ali are listed as numbers 12, 6 and 10 respectively.) No one, not even the most magnanimous of people, names his son after his enemies who were responsible for the death of his wife. That is why one simply cannot find a Shi'i today named Abu Bakr, 'Umar or 'Uthman. In fact, reports from Iran have it that Shi'i officials will not allow Iranian Sunnis to give their children these names. (See the article "The Dismal Reality of the Ahlus Sunnah in Iran" at <http://www.islam.org.au/articles/24/iran.htm>)

Another fact of history which clashes with the alleged persecution of 'Ali and Fatimah by the Sahabah is the marriage of Umm Kulthoom, the daughter of 'Ali and Fatimah, to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab. This marriage, in which 'Ali ibn Abi Talib gave this daughter borne to him by Fatimah, in marriage to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab—the very same man whom the Shi'ah allege caused the death of Fatimah—assails the foundations of Shi'ism in a way that few issues can. It threw the house of Shi'ism into violent disorder, and the 'ulama of the Shi'ah, reeling under its impact, found themselves lunging at just about any twig in sight. This paper looks at the various Shi'i responses to the marriage of Umm Kulthoom to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, and demonstrates the embarrassment in the Shi'i camp to which this contradictory cacophony of responses eloquently testifies.

THE MARRIAGE OF UMM Kulthoom

Umm Kulthoom was the second daughter of 'Ali and Fatimah, and the youngest of their four children. She was born in about the year 6 AH. She became of marriagable age during the khilafah of 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, and the khalifah asked for her hand in marriage. This is recorded by Ibn Sa'd in his work [at-Tabaqat al-Kubra](#) (vol. 8 p. 338, ed. Muhammad 'Ab al-Qadir 'Ata, Dar al-Kutub al-'Ilmiyyah, Beirut 1990) as follows:

I was informed by Anas ibn 'Iyad al-Laythi, who reports on the authority of Ja'far ibn Muhammad [as-Sadiq], and he from his father [Muhammad al-Baqir]—

that 'Umar ibn al-Khattab asked 'Ali ibn Abi Talib for the hand of Umm Kulthoom in marriage. 'Ali said, "I had kept my daughters for the sons of Ja'far." 'Umar said, "Marry her to me, O Abul Hasan, for by Allah, there is no man on the face of the earth who seeks to achieve through her good companionship that which I seek to achieve." 'Ali said, "I have done so."

Then 'Umar came to the Muhajirun between the grave [of Rasulullah r] and the pulpit. They—'Ali, 'Uthman, Zubayr, Talhah and 'Abd ar-Rahman—used to sit there, and whenever a matter used to arrive from the frontiers, 'Umar used to come to them there and consult with them. He came to them and said, "Congratulate me." They congratulated him, and asked, "With whom are we congratulating you, O Amir al-Mu'minin?" He replied, "With the daughter of 'Ali ibn Abi Talib."

Then he related to them that the Nabi r said, "Every tie of kinship, and every association will be cut off on the Day of Qiyamah, except my kinship and my association." ['Umar said,] "I have had the companionship of Rasulullah r ; I would like also to have this [kinship]."

Two children were born from this marriage, namely Zayd and Ruqayyah. After the martyrdom of 'Umar she was married to her cousin 'Awn ibn Ja'far, and after his death to his brother Muhammad ibn Ja'far. Ultimately she died while married to a third of the sons of Ja'far, namely 'Abdullah during the first half of the fourth decade after the Hijrah. Her son Zayd died on the same day as his mother, and the funeral prayer for mother and son was performed together.

The marriage of Umm Kulthoom has been unanimously accepted as a fact of history by all major biographers and historians. Its authenticity has never been contested by anyone—not even the staunchest Shi'ah—during the first four centuries after the Hijrah. It was only during the fifth century that ash-Shaykh al-Mufid (died 413 AH) appears to have woken up to the threat that the acceptance of this marriage holds for the doctrine of the Shi'ah and their particular view of history.

At this moment it needs to be noted that the above narration was recorded by Ibn Sa'd from a man called Anas ibn 'Iyad al-Laythi, who report directly on the authority of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq, and he from his father Muhammad al-Baqir. In other words, we have here a purely Shi'i chain of narration. Anas ibn 'Iyad al-Laythi is regarded by reputable Shi'i rijal, critics such as an-Najashi and Ibn Mutahhar al-Hilli, as a companion of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq who was "[thiqah, sahih al-hadith](#)" (reliable, a transmitter of authentic hadith). (See al-Ardabili, [Jami' ar-Ruwat](#), vol. 1 p. 109, Dar al-Adwa, Beirut 1983) Since he narrates directly from the "infallible" Imam, there can be no question about the veracity of his report. Thereupon, his report is corroborated by a wealth of other narrations all of which affirm the historicity of this marriage. Above it all is the fact that for over three centuries this marriage remained uncontested.

In later centuries the marriage of Umm Kulthoom would become a major bone of contention for Shi'i polemicists. This marriage as a topic in Shi'i theology owes its importance to its open contradiction to Shi'i views of religion and history. This is expressed by the Shi'i authors Muhammad al-Hassun and Umm 'Ali Mashkur in their book [A'lam an-Nisa al-Mu'minat](#) (p. 182) in the following terms:

The marriage of Umm Kulthoom to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab is counted amongst the important issues presented to us by Islamic history, and as one of those matters around which debate and research has continued at length—and still continues. Those who regard this marriage as an authentic fact use it to prove the righteousness of her husband ['Umar] and 'Ali's acceptance of him. Otherwise, why would he give him his daughter in marriage? As for those who reject the historic occurrence of the marriage, or are of the opinion that it took place under pressure which 'Umar brought to bear upon 'Ali use this issue to justify the unrighteousness and viciousness of 'Umar, and that 'Ali did not approve of him.

Shi'i Writings On The Marriage Of Umm Kulthoom

The same authors then proceed to enumerate a list of five independent books on the marriage of Umm Kulthoom written by the 'ulama of the Shi'ah from as early as the 4th century, down to as late as the present age. This list is not exhaustive, and excludes discussions of the same issue in other larger works. The works listed are:

[al-Mas'alah al-Muwaddihah 'an Asbab Nikah Amir al-Mu'minin](#)

—by ash-Shaykh al-Mufid (died 413 AH). It is alternatively entitled [Nkah Amir al-Mu'minin Ibnatahu min 'Umar](#). This book is mentioned by Aqa Buzurg Tehrani in [adh-Dhari'ah](#) (vol. 2 p. 396 no. 3641) and a manuscript of it is kept at the library of Ayatullah Mar'ashi Najafi in Qum.

[Jawab as-Su'al 'an Wajh Tazwij Amir al-Mu'minin Ibnatahu min 'Umar](#)

—by Sayyid Murtada (died 436 AH). It is also mentioned by Aqa Buzurg Tehrani (vol. 5 p. 183 no. 811) and a copy is preserved at the library of Ayatullah Mar'ashi Najafi in Qum.

Tazwij 'Umar li-Umm Kulthoom

—by Shaykh Sulayman ibn Abdullah al-Mahuzi (died 1121 AH). It is mentioned by Tehrani in *adh-Dhari'ah*.

Tazwij Umm Kulthoom bint Amir al-Mu'minin wa-Inkar Wuqu'ih

—by Shaykh Muhammad Jawad al-Balaghi (died 1352AH/1932). It is mentioned by Tehrani at two places in *adh-Dhari'ah* (vol. 4 p. 172 and vol. 11 p. 146).

an independent treatise by Sayyid Nasir Husayn of Lucknow, India (died 1361AH/1941).

The above clearly demonstrates the attention the marriage of Umm Kulthoom has enjoyed with Shi'i authors, and indicates the strategic importance of this marriage in Sunni-Shi'i polemics and dialogue.

Chronologically speaking, attitudes amongst the Shi'ah towards the marriage of Umm Kulthoom can be divided into three stages: (1) before the 5th century AH, (2) after the 5th century AH, and (3) after the establishment of the Safavid Empire in the 10th century. Each of these stages will now be dealt with separately.

PRIOR TO THE FIFTH CENTURY

Shi'i activity during the first century after the Hijrah had been confined to a large extent to revolutionary insurrections, starting from the campaign of the Tawwabun who sought to avenge the murder of Husayn, and continuing in the exploits of people like Mukhtar ath-Thaqafi and Abu Muslim al-Khurasani. It was only during the latter half of the second century that evidence begins to surface of some sort of intellectual activity amongst the Shi'ah. However, here too, the scope of that activity was limited to the documentation of the sayings which the Shi'ah ascribe to their Imams.

The fourth century after the Hijrah witnessed the compilation of Muhammad ibn Ya'qub al-Kulayni's monumental work *al-Kafi*. This work enjoys the following distinctions:

in it the author sought to document the minor compilations of Shi'i hadith by previous authors into one major compendium

it was compiled in Baghdad during the Minor Occultation of the Hidden Imam (as stated by Aqa Buzurg Tehrani in *adh-Dhari'ah*, vol. 17 p. 245) at a time when the representative of the Imam resided in that city, which afforded the opportunity for its contents to be scrutinised and ratified by the Imam himself (as stated by Ibn Tawus in his book *Kashf al-Mahajjah*, p. 159) This is in itself proof of the authenticity of the narrations contained in the book (says al-Hurr al-'Amili in *Wasa'il ash-Shi'ah*, vol. 20 p. 71).

it actually bears the seal of approval of the Hidden Imam himself, and he was the one who named it "al-Kafi" (meaning "sufficient") by saying, as reported by al-Khwansari in *Rawdat al-Jannat* (vol. 6 p.116): "hadha kafin li-shi'atina" (This is sufficient for our Shi'ah).

In this work the author has documented at least **FOUR** traditions to the Imams which affirm the marriage of Umm Kulthoom to 'Umar. In fact, he has devoted the 23rd chapter in the Book on Marriage (*Kitab an-Nikah*) in *Furu' al-Kafi* to the marriage of Umm Kulthoom (*bab tazwij Umm Kulthoom*). Two of the four traditions are contained in this chapter, while the other two are found in a related chapter on where a widow whose husband has died should spend her waiting period, or 'iddah (*bab al-mutawaffa 'anha zawjuha al-madkhul biha ayna ta'taddu wa ma yajibu 'alayha*).

However some of these traditions impart a unique flavour to the entire episode, in that now for the first time it becomes presented as a marriage concluded by sheer force and terror, in which 'Ali ibn Abi Talib, for all his nobility and courage, could not protect his young daughter, and was compelled, on threat of physical violence to his person, to give her to the khalifah. The traditions documented in *al-Kafi* are as follows:

'Ali ibn Ibrahim—from his father—from Ibn Abi 'Umayr—from Hisham ibn Salim and Hammad—from Zurarah, who narrates that

—Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq said regarding the marriage of Umm Kulthoom: **"That was a 'woman' who was taken from us by force."** (*Furu' al-Kafi*, vol. 5 p. 347, Dar al-Adwa, Beirut 1992)

[The word 'woman' here is an attempt from the writer of this article to preserve the honour of the Ahl al-Bayt, since a literal translation of the original Arabic would prove too vulgar.]

Muhammad ibn Abi 'Umayr—Hisham ibn Salim, who narrates that

—Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq said: **"When ['Umar] proposed to Amir al-Mu'minin, he said, 'She is a child.'**

Then he ['Umar] met 'Abbas and asked him, 'What is wrong with me? Is there a problem with me?' 'Abbas asked, 'Why?' 'Umar replied, 'I asked your nephew for his daughter's hand in marriage, and he rejected me. Oh, I swear by Allah, I will fill the well of Zamzam with earth, I will destroy every honour that you have, and I will set up two witnesses to testify that he stole, that I may cut off his right hand.'

'Abbas thereupon came to 'Ali and informed him of what had transpired. He asked 'Ali to put the matter in his hands, and 'Ali complied." (*Furu' al-Kafi*, vol. 5 p. 347-348, Dar al-Adwa, Beirut 1992)

Humayd ibn Ziyad—Ibn Sama'ah—Muhammad ibn Ziyad—'Abdullah ibn Sinan—Mu'awiyah ibn 'Ammar—Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq:

—[Mu'awiyah ibn 'Ammar says:] I asked him about a woman whose husband died: Should she spend her 'iddah in her house, or where she wants to? He replied, **"Where she wants to. When 'Umar died, 'Ali u came and took Umm Kulthoom to his house."** (*Furu' al-Kafi*, vol. 6 p. 117, Dar al-Adwa, Beirut 1992)

Muhammad ibn Yahya and others—Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Isa—al-Husayn ibn Sa'id—an-Nadr ibn Suwayd—Hisham ibn Salim—Sulayman ibn Khalid, who says:

—I asked Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq about the woman whose husband has

died: Where should she spend her 'iddah? In her husband's house, or where she wants to? He said: "**Where she wants to. When 'Umar died, 'Ali u came, took Umm Kulthoom by the hand, and took her to his house.**" (Furu' al-Kafi, vol. 6 p. 117, Dar al-Adwa, Beirut 1992)

Authenticity

We have here four chains of narration up to Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq. An investigation into the authenticity of these chains of narration by Shi'i—and not Sunni—standards reveals that each and every one of them is a highly reliable and accurate chain.

NARRATION 1

al-Kulayni received the reports from Ibn Abi 'Umayr through his teacher **'Ali ibn Ibrahim ibn Hashim al-Qummi**, who is his source for about one third of the material in *al-Kafi*. 'Ali ibn Ibrahim is the author of an early Tafsir of the Shi'ah, and is highly regarded by Shi'i rijal critics such as an-Najashi and Ibn Mutahhar, who declare him to be "thiqatun fil hadith, thabt, mu'tamad, sahih al-madhab" (reliable in hadith transmission, reliable dependable, correct in belief.) (*Jami' ar-Ruwat* vol. 1 p. 545)

'Ali ibn Ibrahim al-Qummi reports from his father **Ibrahim ibn Hashim al-Qummi**. He is reputed to have been the first to spread the hadith of the Shi'ah from Kufah to Qum. Reports via him abound in *al-Kafi*, through his son. He has been generally accepted by the Shi'ah as a reliable narrator. He is even mentioned by Abu Ja'far at-Tusi as having met the 9th Imam. (*Jami' ar-Ruwat* vol. 1 p. 38) His reliability as a narrator is attested to in a contemporary work on the authority of his son, Ali ibn Ibrahim, Ibn Tawus and al-'Allamah al-Hilli. (Abu Talib at-Tajil at-Tabrizi, *Mu'jam ath-Thiqat*, p. 5)

Ibrahim ibn Hashim al-Qummi reports on the authority of **Muhammad ibn Abi 'Umayr**. This Ibn Abi 'Umayr is one of the most reliable Shi'i narrators ever. Abu Ja'far at-Tusi says of him: "kana min awthaq an-nas" (he was of the most reliable of people). (*al-Fihrist* p. 169) More importantly, he was of the elect group of Shi'i narrators called the *Ashab al-Ijma'* (Men of the Consensus). What this means is that when the chain of narration is proven authentic up to one of these men, the rest of the chain up to the Imam may automatically be assumed to be authentic too. (See the details of this consensus in al-Mamaqani, *Miqbas al-Hidayah fi 'Ilm ad-Dirayah*, vol. 2 pp. 171-208) The authenticity of this narration is therefore proven on grounds of this consensus.

NARRATION 2

This report also came down to al-Kulayni through 'Ali ibn Ibrahim, from his father, from Ibn Abi 'Umayr. The discussion on the first chain of narration is therefore fully applicable to this chain too.

NARRATION 3

al-Kulayni reports this narration from his teacher **Humayd ibn Ziyad**. This Humayd is graded by the Shi'i rijal critics as "alim jalil al-qadr,

wasi' al-'ilm, kathir at-tasnif, thiqah" (a learned scholar, of great status, wide knowledge, a prolific author, reliable) (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 1 p. 284)

Ibn Sama'ah is properly known as al-Hasan ibn Muhammad ibn Sama'ah. He was one of the foremost Shi'i fuqaha of Kufah, and is described as "kathir al-hadith, faqihun thiqah" (a prolific narrator of hadith, a jurist, reliable). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 1 p. 225)

Muhammad ibn Ziyad is properly known as Muhammad ibn al-Hasan ibn Ziyad al-'Attar. He is described as "thiqah" (reliable). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 2 p. 91)

'Abdullah ibn Sinan was an eminent Imami Shi'i of Kufah about whom it is stated: "thiqatun min ashabina, la yut'anu 'alayhi fi shay'" (one of our reliable associates against whom no criticism whatsoever can be levelled). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 1 p. 487)

Mu'awiyah ibn 'Ammar was an eminent and leading Shi'i narrator of Kufah who narrates from Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq. His Shi'i biographers have documented about him that he was "wajhan min ashabina muqaddaman, kabir ash-shan, azim al-mahall, thiqah" (a leading figure amongst our associates, pre-eminent, great in status, exalted in position, reliable). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 2 p. 239)

The opinions of the Shi'i critics of hadith regarding the narrators of this report as reproduced here unequivocally indicate that what we have here is a authentic report.

NARRATION 4

al-Kulayni recorded this report on the authority of his several of his teachers, one of whom is **Muhammad ibn Yahya al'Attar al-Qummi**. He was regarded as "shaykhu ashabina fi zamanihi, thiqah, 'ayn, kathir al-hadith" (the shaykh of our associates in his time, reliable, an outstanding personality, a prolific narrator of hadith). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 2 p. 213)

Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn Isa al-Qummi was "shaykh al-Qummiyyin, wa-wajhuhum, wa-faqihuhum, ghayra mudafa" (the shaykh of the people of Qum, and their undisputed leader and jurist). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 1 p. 69) Abu Ja'far at-Tusi and al-'Allamah al-Hilli have unequivocally declared him "thiqah" (reliable). (ar-Rijal p. 366; and al-Khulasah p. 13)

al-Husayn ibn Sa'id is described as "'ayn, jalil al-qadr" (an outstanding personality of great stature) and "thiqah" (reliable). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 1 p. 241)

an-Nadr ibn Suwayd is rated as "Kufi, thiqah, sahih al-hadith" (a reliable Kufan who transmits authentic hadith). (Jami' ar-Ruwat, vol. 2 p. 292)

Hisham ibn Salim is credited with having been a student of Imam Ja'far

as-Sadiq. His reliability as a transmitter of hadith is attested to by the emphatic statement of al-'Allamah and an-Najashi: "thiqatun thiqah" (reliable, and once again reliable). (*Jami' ar-Ruwat*, vol. 2 p. 315)

Sulayman ibn Khalid is mentioned as having been a student of Imam al-Baqir. His death is recorded to have caused Imam Ja'far extreme grief. He is universally acclaimed as "thiqah" (reliable). (*Jami' ar-Ruwat*, vol. 1 p. 378)

This investigation concludes that each of the narrators of the four narrations affirming the marriage of Umm Kulthoom documented in *al-Kafi* was a reliable Imami Shi'i transmitter with whose abilities and trustworthiness in hadith transmission the Shi'i authorities have expressed their satisfaction. The significance of this fact will come to light when we discuss the turnabout that occurred after the development of Shi'i *kalam* (scholastic theology) at the hands of ash-Shaykh al-Mufid in the fifth century.

Besides al-Kulayni, there were during this time other Shi'i authors too who affirmed the marriage of Umm Kulthoom in a way much similar to that of al-Kulayni. One of these was Abul Qasim al-Kufi (died 352 AH). He devoted a number of pages in his book *al-Istighathah fi Bida' ath-Thalathah* to the marriage of Umm Kulthoom, and after presenting several arguments and counter arguments, he concludes the following:

Rasulullah r entrusted upon 'Ali u all that he needed at the time of his death. He informed him of everything that will be done to him by his Ummah, mentioning the usurpers one by one. 'Ali u said, "What do you command me to do?" and Rasulullah r answered, "Have patience and forbearance until the people return to you of their own volition. At that time you must fight the breakers of oaths, the unjust and those who out of the fold. Do not oppose any of the Three, for thereby you will bring about your own destruction, and the people will go from hypocrisy to disunity."

'Ali u was thus keeping this covenant, protecting thereby the oppressed Muslims, and preserving the Religion, so that people would not return to open Jahiliyyah, with tribes seeking to stir up sedition by settling old scores.

Thus, when 'Umar asked for the hand of Umm Kulthoom, 'Ali u thought to himself: "If I say no, he will want to kill me, and if he tries to kill me I will protect myself, and that would mean breaking the covenant with Rasulullah r and going against his command. Should that happen, that thing would come to pass which Rasulullah r tried to prevent, and for which reason he asked me to exercise patience, which is that people will fall into apostasy." It was better to hand over Umm Kulthoom to him than to kill him. He thus handed her over to him, knowing fully well that what the man had usurped of the wealth of the Muslims and of their government, and what he had perpetrated by denying his ('Ali's) right and sitting on the place of the Prophet r , and his changes to and corruption of the laws and ordinances of Allah were far more terrible and dreadful than his forcible possession of his daughter. He handed her over, and resigned himself to patience, just like the Prophet r had ordered him to do.

In doing so he placed his daughter in a position similar to that of Asiyah bint Muzahim, the wife of Fir'awn, since Allah mentions her in the words: "She said: O my Lord, build for me a house by you in Paradise, and save

me from Fir'awn and his doings, and save me from the unjust people." Indeed, what Fir'awn had wreaked upon Bani Isra'il—killing their infants and raping their women—in his search for Musa was much more ghastlier than his forcible possession of his wife Asiyah, and his marriage to her. She is a believing woman and of the people of Paradise, as attested to by Allah Himself.

The case of this man with Umm Kulthoom is the same as the case of Fir'awn with Asiyah. His unjust usurpation of leadership, wherein he opposed Allah and His Messenger r , by denying the Imam his right, and his confiscation of the government of the Muslims, whilst governing their wealth, their persons and their lives with laws other than the laws of Allah and His Messenger r —all of that was more dreadful in the sight of Allah than his forcible possession of the bodies of a thousand believing women, not even to mention the body of a single woman. (al-Istighathah fi Bida' ath-Thalathah p. 90)

Abul Qasim al-Kufi seems not to spare a moment's thought for the fact that this was not just any woman. This was the daughter of 'Ali and Fatimah. This was the granddaughter of Rasulullah r . This was the sister of Hasan and Husayn. What the Shi'ah here seek to subject their Imam 'Ali ibn Abi Talib to is unspeakable. Which father would sit by idly while his daughter is being forcibly taken by an abominable enemy? This is the extent to which their twisting and corruption of history has led them—that they are prepared to place upon their Imams the kind of shame that even the simplest ones amongst themselves would never bear. *And the evil plot only entraps its own people.* (al-Fatir:43)

In addition, this attempt by Abul Qasim al-Kufi to explain the marriage of Umm Kulthoom is full of discrepancies, some of which we will make mention of hereunder:

The comparison between Umm Kulthoom and Asiyah is unjustified. Asiyah was not the daughter of a Nabi who was forced to hand her over in marriage to a tyrant. She was married to him even before Musa was born. Her marriage to Fir'awn was not concluded under threat and compulsion, neither could it have been caused her father (whoever he was) any sort of embarrassment.

Abul Qasim's report speaks of Rasulullah r informing 'Ali of exactly what would be done to him by each of the three khulafa. He must therefore have known that 'Umar will demand his daughter. Yet when the time comes to pass he refuses the marriage on grounds that she is too young (see the second narration from al-Kafi), and even Abul Qasim's own report mentions him weighing his options. Someone who knows what is coming has no need to weigh his options.

The reason for preserving the peace with the three khulafa is given as the fear that people will revert into apostasy. Yet in a narration from Imam al-Baqir documented in al-Kafi, apostasy is mentioned to have set in immediately after the death of Rasulullah r : "Kana n-nasu ahla riddatin ba'da Rasulillahi r illa thalathah" (After the death of Rasulullah r the people were apostates, except three.) (Rawdat al-Kafi, vol. 8 p. 167, no. 341) If they were thus already apostate, what reason did he have to sacrifice his own daughter's honour and chastity in order to preserve the non-existent?

However, despite all Abul Qasim al-Kufi's effort in working out a logical explanation of why 'Ali ibn Abi Talib gave his daughter in marriage to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, later Shi'i scholars like al-Mufid could find no place for his arguments within their recension of Shi'i doctrines.

AFTER THE FIFTH CENTURY

With the ascendancy of the Shi'i Buyids at Baghdad during the latter half of the fourth century, Shi'i scholarship gained the patronage it required, and there developed under ash-Shaykh al-Mufid a school of Shi'i theology that was to leave its lasting upon Shi'ism. This school took full advantage of the methods and techniques of the existing schools of theology, especially the rationalist approach of the Mu'tazilah. It adopted and appropriated Mu'tazili methods to its own advantage, and rationalised much of what had earlier been left to the domain of textual authority.

The marriage of Umm Kulthoom did not escape this process of rationalisation. When this issue was discovered to run against the grain of Shi'i theology—a theology that has its roots in a particular perspective of history—there was but one of two options open to the rationalisers. They could choose the way of Abul Qasim al-Kufi, al-Kulayni and other traditionists, and accept the marriage as a union achieved by force and threats of violence. But this option, instead of solving the problem, created another problem. The other option left open to them was to do a complete turnabout and deny that this marriage ever took place.

Ash-Shaykh Al-Mufid

The lead was taken by ash-Shaykh al-Mufid himself. He wrote an independent treatise about the marriage of Umm Kulthoom, and discussed it in his other works as well, most notably [al-Masa'il as-Sarawiyyah](#). The tenth question in this books deal with the marriage of Umm Kulthoom. It reads as follows:

TENTH QUESTION: What is his (al-Mufid's) view regarding Amir al-Mu'minin marrying his daughter Umm Kulthoom to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab, and regarding the Nabi r marrying his daughters Zaynab (sic) and Ruqayah to 'Uthman?

ANSWER: The report speaking of Amir al-Mu'minin marrying his daughter to 'Umar ibn al-Khattab so unfounded. It is narrated via Zubayr ibn Bakkar, and its chain of narration is well known. He was untrustworthy in transmission. There is suspicion on him in what he mentions. He used to hate Amir al-Mu'minin. What 'Ali ibn Hashim claims to narrate from him is untrustworthy. This hadith was included by Abu Muhammad al-Hasan ibn Yahya in his book on genealogy, and account of that people thought it to be true, thinking that it is narrated by an 'Alawi (descendant of 'Ali). However, the fact is that he narrates it from Zubayr ibn Bakkar.

The hadith in itself is a forgery. It is sometimes narrated that Amir al-Mu'minin himself performed the ceremony, and sometimes it is narrated that it was 'Abbas who performed it. Sometimes it is narrated that the marriage took place only after menacing by 'Umar and threats against Banu Hashim; and sometimes it is mentioned that the marriage took place freely and voluntarily. The some narrators claim that a child named Zayd was born from this marriage, while others claim he was killed before consummating the marriage. Some say Zayd ibn 'Umar left offspring, while others say he was killed without leaving children. Some say he and his mother were killed, and some say his mother lived after him. Some say 'Umar gave Umm Kulthoom a dowry of 40 000 dirhams, others claim it was 4000 dirhams, and yet others claim her dowry was 5000 dirhams. The origin of this claim, as well as the amount of contradiction in it renders the hadith null, so it is of no consequence.

At this point the benefit of investigating the authenticity of the four reports in [al-Kafi](#) will become apparent. It can be seen here that al-Mufid places the responsibility for inventing the marriage of Umm Kulthoom on the shoulders of the historian Zubayr ibn Bakkar. However, even a cursory comparison with the narrations in [al-Kafi](#) and the one quoted earlier from [Tabaqat Ibn Sa'd](#) (all of which are but a drop in the ocean) demonstrates clearly that Zubayr ibn Bakkar features nowhere in any of those chains of narration. Each of the narrators of those reports was a Shi'i about whose trustworthiness the 'ulama of the Shi'ah were fully satisfied. Not a single one of those reports originated with Zubayr ibn Bakkar. On the contrary, each one of them is traced back to Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq. Al-Mufid's protestations are thus completely bereft of substance. If anything, it shows the man's desperation for finding some grounds, no matter how flimsy or spurious, on which to dismiss the marriage of Umm Kulthoom.

Aside from trying to make Zubayr ibn Bakkar responsible for the invention of the marriage of Umm Kulthoom, al-Mufid tries to dismiss the incident by drawing attention to the discrepancies regarding certain lesser details. A simple response to this is that when a multitude of reports all share one common element, the common element cannot be dismissed because of differences negligible details. An objective scholar who is not prejudiced by his idiosyncratic notion of what history should actually be like will never stoop to the level al-Mufid has. Objectivity here would require thoroughly sifting through the available historical material and accepting the version that fulfils the criteria of authenticity, such as have been demonstrated in the case of al-Kulayni's narrations in [al-Kafi](#). If an historical incident could be denied for a reason as flimsy as discrepancies in minor details, one could well reject the battle of Badr on grounds of the fact that there are differences regarding the exact date on which it took place, or differences in the amount of combatants, or even the amount of persons killed and taken captive. Here we are once again treated to the spectacle of a scholar's desperation to superimpose the idiosyncracies of his theology over the facts of history, even if it means he has to discard the most basic standards of objectivity.

At the end al-Mufid's nonchalance failed to convince anyone—including himself. Therefore, two paragraphs after denying the occurrence of Umm Kulthoom's marriage he comes back to fall into the queue of traditional Shi'i scholarship behind people like al-Kulayni and Abul Qasim al-Kufi, and writes:

Amir al-Mu'minin was coerced to marry his daughter to the man, because he was threatening and menacing him. There can thus be no argument against Amir al-Mu'minin because he was forced into it for his own safety and that of his Shi'ah. He therefore complied under duress, just as we say that duress allows for even the pronouncement of Kufr. Allah says: "Except him who is forced, but his heart is content in faith."

There is no end to one's amazement at seeing how this man would place the safety of the Shi'ah ("for his own safety and that of his Shi'ah") over the chastity and honour of his Imam's daughter, and the granddaughter of Rasulullah r .

After al-Mufid

The first explanation produced by al-Mufid—that of denying the historicity of the marriage—was so ludicrous that he failed to convince even himself. His own student, the eminent Sayyid Murtada (died 436 AH), brother of the compiler of [Nahj al-Balaghah](#), Sayyid Radi, was even less impressed by his teacher's artifices. He solemnly stuck to the line of traditional Shi'i scholarship, insisting that the marriage was one of coercion and force. He dealt with the marriage of Umm Kulthoom in two of his books. In the book [ash-Shafi](#) he discussed it at considerable length, the gist of which he later incorporated into his other book [Tanzih al-Ambiya wal-A'immah](#), where he writes:

As for giving his daughter in marriage, we have mentioned the answer to this in the book [ash-Shafi](#) in detail, and that he only consented to give his daughter after he had been threatened and menaced and after there had been altercations at length.

After Sayyid Murtada, Abu 'Ali al-Fadl ibn Hasan at-Tabarsi, the Shi'i mufassir of the 6th century (died 502 AH) stuck to the same line. He writes in his book *I'lam al-Wara bi-A'lam al-Huda* (p. 204):

As for Umm Kulthoom, she is the one whom 'Umar ibn al-Khattab married. Our associates say that he ('Ali) only married her to him after putting up a lot of resistance, severe refusals and finding excuses. Ultimately he was forced by circumstances to turn her matter over to 'Abbas ibn 'Abd al-Muttalib who married her off.

A later Shi'i scholar, Shaykh 'Abd an-Nabi al-Kazimi, writes in his book *Takmilat ar-Rijal*:

The well known view of our associates, and the well known narrations are that 'Umar married her by force, as Sayyid Murtada emphatically insists in his treatise on the issue. In light of the narrations this is the more correct view. These narrations remove whatever doubt there might have been regarding how Amir al-Mu'minin could marry his daughter to him, when according to what the Shi'ah believe it is not supposed to be permissible to have marital ties with him, since forcible possession and duress render everything permissible. The same applies to the objection regarding how he could have borne this forcible taking of his daughter when the very Hashimite spirit and Arab sense of honour would not tolerate such utter humiliation and insult. These texts settle the matter completely.

Having found this niche of the "forced taking" of Umm Kulthoom, these 'ulama of the Shi'ah took refuge in it from the torrent of questions and the utter indignation of anyone who witnesses the way in which they have shed their own shame and dishonour upon the memory of Sayyiduna 'Ali, Sayyidah Fatima, and their daughter Umm Kulthoom, the granddaughter of Rasulullah r . Year in and year out they wail and lament the death of Sayyiduna Husayn, but for the honour of his sister Umm Kulthoom they have not the slightest sympathy, blithely asserting that she was "forcibly taken" by 'Umar ibn al-Khattab. Wouldn't it be simpler, easier and indeed more honourable and truthful just to accept the course of history as it was? But no, to them that would mean the destruction of this edifice of theirs called Shi'ism. So it is better for them to sacrifice the honour of the granddaughter of Rasulullah r than to forgo the doctrines which their own minds fashioned. As al-Mufid indicated, rather secure the safety of the Shi'ah than protect the honour of Umm Kulthoom bint 'Ali.

AFTER THE FOUNDING

OF THE SAFAVID EMPIRE

The founding of the Safavid empire in Iran at the dawn of the 16th century CE opened a new chapter in Shi'i history. Shi'i scholarship in particular benefitted from the patronage of the Safavid monarchs who invited them to fill the void left by the extermination and exile of the Sunni 'ulama of Iran. Though at first reluctant, they soon flowed into Iran in large numbers from Iraq, Bahrain and Syria, to fill posts created by the newly established Shi'i state, and to spread their faith amongst the people of Iran, the vast majority of whom were at that stage still Sunni.

The establishment of a Shi'i state did not bring discussion around the marriage of Umm Kulthoom to an end.

Who Killed Al-Hussain?

Unmasking The Other Villains Of Karbalâ

Retelling the tragedy of Karbalâ has traditionally been an important feature of Shî'î spirituality. The passion plays of Iran and the Indian subcontinent, the literature, both prose and poetry, composed upon the subject of the martyrdom of Sayyidunâ Husayn radiyallâhu 'anhu and the general atmosphere of mourning that reigns amongst the Shî'ah during the month of Muharram, all bear eloquent testimony to importance of that event in the Shî'î calendar. To the Shî'ah, 'Âshurâ is probably the most important day of the year.

However, it is regrettable that despite the huge amount of attention the subject of Karbalâ enjoys, the event is persistently portrayed as two-sided. It is always depicted as Husayn against Yazîd, Right rising up against Wrong, the Quest for Justice against the Forces of Oppression. Many an opportunist has even gone to the extent of superimposing upon the event the theme of Shî'ah against Ahl as-Sunnah.

In this partial retelling that concentrates upon what actually happened at Karbalâ, and conveniently draws attention away from the other guilty party in the 'Âshurâ tragedy, lies another tragedy in itself. For while Husayn's martyrdom has been oft commemorated, and his physical opponents and killers identified, cursed and eliminated, no one has spared a moment's anger for those who deserted him at the crucial hour. It is these men in the shadows, who squarely deserve to be called the real villains of Karbalâ, upon whom this article seeks to cast light.

It was in Ramadân 60AH that the letters from Kûfah started to arrive at the house of 'Abbâs ibn 'Abd al-Muttalib in Makkah where Husayn ibn 'Alî was staying after his flight from Madînah, letters urging him to lead the Kû fans into revolt against Yazîd ibn Mu'âwiyah, and assuring him of their loyalty and allegiance. Mu'âwiyah died two months earlier, and there was much resentment for his son Yazîd for whom the bay'ah was taken as his successor. The people of Kûfah especially were looking at Husayn for leadership, and soon there was stream of letters coming in from Kûfah. On certain days there would be as many as 600 letters, with messengers who enthusiastically described the support he would receive from the Kûfans.

Kûfah was a unique place, and the Kûfans a peculiar people. In 37AH Sayyidunâ 'Alî radiyallâhu 'anhu shifted his capital from Madînah to Kûfah, and ever since that city became the home of those who claimed partisanship of the Ahl al-Bayt. After the reconciliation between Hasan and Mu'âwiyah in 41AH many of those who had been in Sayyidunâ Hasan's army settled in Kûfah. At the time of Mu'âwiyah's death in 60AH pro-'Alid sentiments were still to be found in abundance in Kûfah. At the time of Mu'âwiyah's death in 60 AH Kûfah was still very strongly pro-' Alid. Thus when the opportunity arose the Kûfans, who still regarded themselves as the Shî'ah (supporters) of the Ahl al-Bayt, turned to Husayn to lead them against Yazîd.

Sayyidunâ Husayn decided to send his cousin Muslim ibn 'Aqîl to investigate the situation in Kûfah. If he found it feasible he would write to inform Husayn, who would depart with his family from Makkah to join him in Kûfah. Muslim arrived in in Dhul Qa'dah. The Kûfans, when they learnt of his arrival presented themselves at the residence of Muslim ibn 'Awsajah al-Asadî where he was staying. Soon there were 12 000 Kûfans who had given their solemn pledge to support and protect Husayn with their lives and all they possessed. When this number rose to 18 000 Muslim felt confident enough to dispatch a messenger to Husayn informing him of the bay'ah of the Kûfans, and urging him to proceed from Makkah.

Rumours of what was happening in Kûfah soon reached Yazîd in Damascus. He immediately replaced Nu'mâ n ibn Bashîr, the governor of Kûfah, with the ruthless 'Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd with

orders to find Muslim ibn 'Aqîl and kill him. Ibn Ziyâd entered Kûfah early in Dhul Hijjah, accompanied by seventeen men on horseback. With the end of his turban drawn over his face he was unrecognisable, and the people of Kûfah, who were expecting Sayyidunâ Husayn, mistook him for Husayn. " Peace upon you, o son of Rasûlullâh," they hailed him. Thus it was that Ibn Ziyâd learnt the truth of the rumours. It was only when one of his mounted men shouted at them, " Stand back! This is the governor 'Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd!" that the Kûfans realised the seriousness of their blunder.

Soon after reaching the governor's residence 'Ubaydullâh sent a servant of his own with a bag containing 3000 dirhams to pose as a newcomer from the Syrian town of Hims eager to join the imminent revolution, and thereby discover the whereabouts of Muslim ibn 'Aqîl. He located Muslim in the house of Hânî ibn 'Urwah, and took the pledge of allegiance at his hands. The money he handed over to Abû Thumâmah al-'Âmirî who was acting as Muslim's treasurer. After staying with them for a few days, during which he learnt most of what there was to know about their intrigue, he returned to Ibn Ziyâd and informed him. Hânî ibn 'Urwah was arrested. At first he denied all knowledge of Muslim's whereabouts, but when the " newcomer from Hims" was brought before him he confessed. But he still refused to reveal where Muslim ibn 'Aqîl was.

In the meantime Muslim came to hear about the arrest of Hânî ibn 'Urwah. Realising that the hour for a decisive encounter had arrived, he raised his battle cry " *Yâ Mansûr* ", at which 4000 of the men who had given him their oath of allegiance and loyalty to Husayn gathered around him and proceeded towards the governor's fort. When he saw Muslim ibn 'Aqîl with the Kûfans at his gate, 'Ubaydullâh sent some of the tribal leaders of Kûfah to speak with their people and draw them away from Muslim and warn them of the wrath that would descend upon them when the armies from Damascus arrived. Soon Muslim's army was upon by mothers telling their sons, " Come home , there are enough other people here," and fathers ominously warning their sons, " What will happen tomorrow when the Syrian armies start arriving from Damascus? What will you do?" The resolve of the men who had taken a sacred oath to support and defend the cause of Husayn and the Ahl al-Bayt against Yazîd and his Syrian armies, the men upon the strength of whose oaths of allegiance and loyalty Sayyidunâ Husayn was on that very moment making his way to Kûfah with his nearest and dearest, the resolve of those men of Kûfah could not hold in the face of such threats and discouragement. One by one they deserted Muslim ibn 'Aqîl under the gates of the governor's fort. At sunset he was left with only 30 men. He led them in Maghrib, and then moved away to the doorway of the Kindah quarter of Kûfah. He went through that door with no more than 10 men, and before he knew it, he was all on his own in the streets of Kûfah. Of all those who had so anxiously and enthusiastically written to Husayn to come and lead them in revolt against Yazîd, and out of the 18 000 men who but days before placed their right hands in his, solemnly pledging allegiance to the cause for which they had invited the grandson of Rasûlullâh ﷺ, not a single one was there to offer Muslim ibn 'Aqîl the solace of their company or refuge from the night.

Eventually, parched with thirst, he knocked at a door. The occupant, an old lady, took him in when she learnt that he was Muslim ibn 'Aqîl. She hid him away in her house, but her son, from whom she extracted a promise not to tell anyone of his presence there, waited only till the morning to take the news to the governor's residence. The next thing Muslim realised was that the house was surrounded. Thrice he managed with his sword to drive the attackers out of the house, but when they started putting fire to the house he was forced to face them outside. It was only when 'Abd ar-Rahmân ibn Muhammad ibn al-Ash'ath, one of those sent to arrest him, promised him the safety of his life, that he lowered his sword. It was a mistake, for they took away his sword and mounted him upon an ass to be taken to Ibn Ziyâd. Muslim knew his death was at hand. Tears flowed from his eyes, not at his own fate, but at the thought of Husayn and his family travelling through the harsh, merciless desert towards a fate much more harsher and merciless, to an enemy firmly resolved to bring an end to his venture, and to the most treacherous of partisans whose desertion at the hour of need had brought his life to this tragic end. He begged Ibn al-Ash'ath to send someone to Husayn with the following message: "Ibn 'Aqîl has sent me to you. He says to you: 'Go back with your family. Do not be deceived by people of Kûfah. They are those same supporters of your father from whom he so dearly wished to part, by death or by being killed. The Kûfans have lied to me and have lied to you, and a liar has no sense.' "

Later that day —the Day of 'Arafah, the 9th of Dhul Hijjah— Muslim ibn 'Aqîl was taken up to the

highest ramparts of the fort. As he was being led up, he recited the [tahlîl](#), [tasbîh](#), [takbîr](#) and [istighfâr](#). His last words reflect his intense disappointment with the people of Kûfah, " O Allâh, You be the Judge between us and our people. They deceived us and deserted us." From high upon the ramparts his head fell down in the dust, in full view of those whose invitations and oaths of allegiance had given him so much to hope for, but whose cowardice and treachery had left him with nothing but despair. And Husayn was on his way...

'Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd had entered Kûfah with only seventeen men. For each man that came with him there was over a thousand who had taken the oath of allegiance at the hands of Muslim ibn 'Aqîl. Yet not a single sword was raised in his defence. Not a single voice had the courage to protest his execution. And these were the same men who had been telling Husayn, "Come, we are with you."

Upon receipt of Muslim's letter, Sayyidunâ Husayn started making arrangements to travel to Kûfah. He immediately despatched a messenger, Qays ibn Mus-hir, to inform the Kûfans of his imminent arrival. This messenger was captured by 'Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd, who ordered him to mount the walls of the fort and publicly curse Husayn and his father. Instead he praised Sayyidunâ 'Alî and Sayyidunâ Husayn, telling them that Husayn was on his way, and exhorting them to assist him as they had promised. He ended his brief address by imprecating curses upon Ibn Ziyâd. Upon the order of Ibn Ziyâd he was flung from the ramparts and killed. Despite this impassioned plea, the men of Kûfah were unmoved.

In Makkah, a number of the eminent Sahâbah and children of Sahâbah tried to dissuade Husayn from going to Kûfah, and reminded him of the fickleness of the Kûfans with both his father and his brother. 'Abdullâh ibn 'Abbâs, 'Abdullâh ibn 'Umar, Jâbir ibn 'Abdillâh, Abû Sa'îd al-Khudrî, his own brother, Muhammad, and his brother-in-law and cousin , 'Abdullâh ibn Ja'far all remonstrated with him and tried to persuade him not to go to Iraq. His mind, however, was made up. He set out from Makkah on the 8th of Dhul Hijjah, not knowing of the sad end of Muslim ibn 'Aqîl.

After an arduous journey of almost a month, his party reached Iraq. It was there that he first heard of the treachery of the Kûfans and the death of Muslim ibn 'Aqîl. Later he also learnt of the death of Qays ibn Mus-hir. A large number of desert Arabs had by that time attached themselves to his party, thinking that Kûfah was already practically his. Husayn addressed them, saying, " Our Shî'ah have deserted us. Therefore, whoever wants to leave is free to do so." Soon he was left with only those who left Makkah with him. With them he continued towards Kûfah.

Meanwhle Kûfah was placed under heave surveillance by Ibn Ziyâd. When news of Husayn's approach reached him, he despatched a 4000 strong contingent, which was on its way to fight the Daylamites, to stop Husayn. This contingent was put under the command of 'Umar ibn Sa'd. There can be little doubt that the Kûfans witnessed the departure of this force from Kûfah with their own eyes. This would be their last chance to honour the oaths of allegiance to Husayn which they had taken upon the hands of Muslim ibn 'Aqîl. This was the final opportunity to rush to the side of the grandson of Rasûlullâh ﷺ. It was after all their invitations and assurances of support that encouraged him to abandon the safety of Makkah for the precarious battlefields of Iraq. But once again faithfulness, courage and commitment was found lacking in the people of Kûfah. Only a handful emerged to join Husayn at Karbalâ.

And when the sun set on the 10th of Muharram, it was too late for the faithless Shî'ah of Kûfah to make amends, for the sands of Karbalâ was stained red with the blood of Sayyidunâ Husayn and his seventy-one followers.

L :

Four years later the Shî'ah of Kûfah attempted to make amends for their desertion of the family of Rasûlullâh ﷺ. There emerged a group of Kûfans calling themselves the [Tawwâbûn](#) (Penitents) who made it their duty to wreak vengeance upon the killers of Husayn. On their way to Syria in pursuit of Ibn Ziyâd they passed by Karbalâ, the site of Sayyidunâ Husayn' s grave, where they raised a great

hue and cry, and spent the night lamenting the tragedy which they allowed to happen four years earlier. Had they only displayed that same spirit of compassion for Husayn when he was so much in need of it the history of Islâm might have taken a different course.

There have been attempts by certain writers to absolve the Shî'ah from the crime of deserting Husayn. Some find an excuse for them in Ibn Ziyâd's blockade of Kûfah. S. H. M. Jafri writes in his book [The Origins and Early Developments of Shi'ah Islam](#):

...it should be noted again that the blockade of all the roads coming into Kûfa and its vicinity made it almost impossible for the majority of those Shî'is of Kûfa who were in hiding, and also for those residing in other cities like Basra.²

This explanation of their desertion does not seem plausible when one considers the large number (18 000) of those who had taken the bay'ah at the hands of Muslim ibn 'Aqîl. Ibn Ziyâd, as we have seen, entered Kûfah with only 17 men. Even the force that he dispatched to engage the party of Sayyidunâ Husayn at Karbalâ consisted of only 4000 men.³ Furthermore, that force was not recruited specifically for Karbalâ; it was only passing through Kûfah on its way to fight the Daylamites. It is not at all credible to assume that Ibn Ziyâd was able to cow the Kûfans into submission with forces such as these, whom they outnumbered by far. It was rather their own treacherousness and fickleness that led them to abandon Sayyidunâ Husayn. This can be clearly seen in the manner they deserted Muslim ibn 'Aqîl.

There is also the tendency of claiming that those who deserted Sayyidunâ Husayn were not of the Shî'ah. Jafri writes:

... of those who invited Husayn to Kûfa, and then those 18,000 who paid homage to his envoy Muslim b. 'Aqîl, not all were Shî'is in the religious sense of the term, but were rather supporters of the house of 'Alî for political reasons - a distinction which must be kept clearly in mind in order to understand the early history of Shî'î Islam.⁴

Jafri's motive in excluding the deserters of Sayyidunâ Husayn from the ranks of the "religious" (as opposed to the "political") supporters of the house of Sayyidunâ 'Alî is quite transparent. He is clearly embarrassed by the fact that it was the Shî'ah themselves who abandoned their Imâm and his family after inviting him to lead them in revolt. What leads us to reject this distinction between "religious" and "political" supporters is the fact that Sayyidunâ Husayn himself, on more than one occasion, referred to the Kûfans as his Shî'ah. There are also the numerous references to the people of Kûfah as the followers (albeit capricious followers) of his father and brother. And were we to assume that many, or even most of them were not Shî'ah in the "religious" sense, the question which next presents itself is: Where were the real Shî'ah when their Imâm required their help? Were they only that handful who emerged from Kûfah? It is strange that while there is so much reluctance on the part of the Shî'ah to accept the desertion of Kûfah as their own, they are quite proud and eager to identify themselves with the movement of the [Tawwâbûn](#). The speeches made at the inception of the movement of the [Tawwâbûn](#) very clearly prove that they were the same people who invited Sayyidunâ Husayn and then deserted him.⁵ Their very name is indicative of their guilt in this regard. The attempt by the Shî'ah to absolve themselves from the crime of deserting Sayyidunâ Husayn is therefore at best nothing more than pathetic.

Karbalâ was not to be the last act of treason by the Shî'ah against the Family of Rasûlullâh ﷺ. Sixty years later the grandson of Sayyidunâ Husayn, namely Zayd ibn 'Alî ibn Husayn, led an uprising against the Umayyad ruler Hishâm ibn 'Abd al-Malik. He received the oaths of allegiance of over 40 000 men, 15 000 of whom were from the very same Kûfah that deserted his grandfather. Just before the battle could start they decided upon a whim to ask his opinion about Abû Bakr and 'Umar. Zayd answered: "I have never heard any of my family dissociate himself from them, and I have nothing but good to say about them." Upset with this answer, they deserted him en masse, deciding that the true imâm could only be his nephew Ja'far as-Sâdiq. Out of 40 000, Zayd was left with only a few hundred men. On the departure of the defectors he remarked: "I am afraid they have done unto me as they did to Husayn." Zayd and his little army fought bravely and attained martyrdom. Thus, on

Wednesday the 1st of Safar 122 AH another member of the Ahl al-Bayt fell victim to the treachery of the Shî'ah of Kûfah.⁶ This time there could be no question as to whether those who deserted him were of the Shî'ah or not.

The fact that the thousands of Shî'ah who deserted Zayd ibn 'Alî looked upon Ja'far as-Sâdiq as their true Imâm shows that by and large they were the same as the Ithnâ 'Asha'rî, or alternatively Imâmî or Ja'farî Shî'ah of today. Why then, if he had so many devoted followers, did Imâm Ja'far not rise up in revolt against the Umayyads or the 'Abbâsids? The answer to this question is provided in a narration documented by Abû Ja'far al-Kulaynî in his monumental work *al-Kâfî*, which enjoys unparalleled status amongst the hadîth collections of the Shî'ah:

Sudayr as-Sayrafî says: I entered the presence of Abû 'Abdillâh *'alayhis salâm* and said to him: "By Allâh, you may not refrain from taking up arms." He asked: "Why not?" I answered: "Because you have so many partisans, supporters (Shî'ah) and helpers. By Allâh, if Amîr al-Mu'minîn (Sayyidunâ 'Alî) had as many Shî'ah, helpers, and partisans as you have, Taym (the tribe of Abû Bakr) and 'Adî (the tribe of 'Umar) would never have had designs upon him." He asked: "And how many would they be, Sudayr?" I said: "A hundred thousand." He asked: "A hundred thousand?" I replied: "Yes, and two hundred thousand." He asked again: "Two hundred thousand?" I replied: "Yes, and half the world." He remained silent.

Then he said: "Would you accompany us to Yanbu'?" I replied in the affirmative. He ordered a mule and a donkey to be saddled. I quickly mounted the donkey, but he said: "Sudayr, will you rather let me ride the donkey?" I said: "The mule is more decorous and more noble as well." But he said: "The donkey is more comfortable for me." I dismounted. He mounted the donkey, I got on the mule, and we started riding. The time of salâh arrived and he said: "Dismount, Sudayr. Let us perform salâh." Then he remarked: "The ground here is overgrown with moss. It is not permissible to make salâh here." So we carried on riding until we came to a place where the earth was red. He looked at a young boy herding sheep, and remarked: "Sudayr, by Allâh, if I had as many Shî'ah as there are sheep here, it would not have been acceptable for me to refrain from taking up arms." We then dismounted and performed salâh. When we were finished I turned back to count the sheep. There were *seventeen* of them.⁷

It seems from this narration that the tragedy of Karbalâ taught Imâm Ja'far as-Sâdiq something about those who claimed to be his followers which the Shî'ah of today are still refusing to come to terms with: that in the trials and misfortunes of the Family of Rasûlullâh ﷺ the role of the Shî'ah was as great, if not greater, than that of their physical enemies. It therefore does not come as a surprise that none of the supposed Imâmîs after Husayn ever attempted an armed insurrection against the rulers of their times. Karbalâ had taught them the fickleness and treacherousness of those who claimed to be their Shî'ah. It is about them that Imâm Ja'far is reported to have said:

*No one bears us greater hatred than those who claim to love us.*⁸

Imâm Ja'far is also reported as having said:

*No verse did Allâh reveal in connection with the Munâfiqîn, except that it is to be found in those who profess Shî'ism.*⁹

Before Sayyidunâ Husayn, his elder brother Sayyidunâ Hasan was the victim of the treacherousness of the Kûfans. In his book *al-Ihtijâj* the prominent Shî'î author Abû Mansûr al-Tabarsî has preserved the following remark of Sayyidunâ Hasan:

*By Allâh, I think Mu'âwiyah would be better for me than these people who claim that they are my Shî'ah.*¹⁰

When Sayyidunâ Hasan eventually became exasperated at the fickleness of his so-called Shî'ah, he decided to make peace with Mu'âwiyah. When someone protested to him that he was bringing humiliation upon the Shî'ah by concluding peace with Mu'âwiyah, he responded by saying:

By Allâh, I handed over power to him for no reason other than the fact that I could not find any supporters. Had I found supporters I would have fought him day and night until Allâh decides between us. But I know the people of Kûfah. I have experience of them. The bad ones of them are no good to me. They have no loyalty, nor any integrity in word or deed. They are in disagreement. They claim that their hearts are with us, but their swords are drawn against us.¹⁰

Imâm Mûsâ al-Kâzim, the son of Imâm Ja'far, and the seventh of the supposed Imâms of the Shî'ah, describes them in the following words:

If I had to truly distinguish my Shî'ah I would find them nothing other than pretenders. If I had to put them to the test I would only find them to be apostates. If I were to scrutinise them I would be left with only one in a thousand. Were I to sift them thoroughly I would be left with only the handful that is truly mine. They have been sitting on cushions all along, saying: " We are the Shî'ah of 'Alî."

If today 'Âshûrâ will be commemorated as a day of struggle and sacrifice, let it also be remembered as a day of treachery and desertion. When the names of Yazîd ibn Mu'âwiyah, 'Ubaydullâh ibn Ziyâd, 'Umar ibn Sa'd and Shamir ibn Dhil Jawshan are mentioned and curses invoked upon their memories, then let us not forget the treachery of the Shî'ah of Kûfah. The time has long been due for the Shî'ah to reintroduce into their 'Âshûrâ ceremonies an aspect that was in fact part of the very first commemoration ceremony of the [Tawwâbûn](#). That lost aspect is the admission of their own guilt, along with that of Ibn Ziyâd, Yazîd and others, in the shedding of the holy blood of Sayyidunâ Husayn ibn 'Alî [radiyallâhu 'anhumâ](#).

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. The historical material for this study has been taken largely from [al-Bidâyah wan-Nihâyah](#) of Ibn Kathîr. The Shî'î source [Maqtal al-Husayn](#) by 'Abd ar-Razzâq al-Mûsawî al-Muqarram (5th edition published by Maktabah Basîratî, Qum in 1382) was also consulted.
2. See S. H. M. Jafri, [The Origins and Early Development of Shi'ah Islam](#) p. 198 (Ansariyan Publications, Qum, n.d.)
3. The figure of 80 000, given in certain Shî'î sources, and quoted recently on local radio, is clearly fictitious. Apart from contradicting reliable historical sources, its origin in the emotionally charged hyperbolism of the Shî'ah is self-evident.
4. Jafri, p. 195
5. *ibid.* p. 223
6. Muhammad Abû Zahrah, [Târîkh al-Madhâhib al-Islâmiyyah](#), p. 613 (Dâr al-Fikr al-'Arabî, Cairo, n.d.)

7. al-Kulaynî, [al-Kâfî \(Usûl\)](#) vol. 2 p. 250-251 (Dâr al-Adwâ, Beiru1992)
8. 'Abdullâh al-Mâmaqânî, [Miqbâs al-Hidâyah](#) vol. 2 p. 414 (Mu'assasat Âl al-Bayt li-lhyâ' at-Turâth, Beirut 1991) quoting from [Rijâl al-Kashshî](#).
9. *ibid.* vol. 2 p. 407
10. Abû Mansûr at-Tabarsî, [al-Ihtijâj](#) vol. 2 p. 290-291 (Mu'assasat al-A'lamî, Beirut 1989)
11. al-Kulaynî, [Rawdat al-Kâfî](#) vol. 8 p. 288

Who Are Ahl Al-Bayt?

Prophet Muhammad ﷺ urged in the past two hadeeths to adhere to his noble household, to know their right, to respect them, and to honor them, may Allah be pleased with them all. But the question is; who are the household of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ?

Hadeeth Al-Thiqalayn indicates to the concept of the Prophet's household clarifying that Ahl Al-Bayt are the relatives of Prophet Muhammad and his wives.

To the completion of the previous hadeeth, The companion of the prophet Zayd who narrated Hadeeth Al-Thiqalayn says: "his wives are among his household, but his household are those who charity is forbidden upon them." One asked: "and who are they?" Zayd answered that they were the household of Ali, household of Aqeel, household of Jaffar, and household of Abbas. The first person asked again: "Upon all of them charity is forbidden?" and Zayd answered by a yes"

Abdulrahman bin Abi Layla, a dignified Companion, says: "Once we asked Prophet Muhammad ﷺ about how to pray on his household although Allah told us how to pray on him. Prophet Muhammad answered: "Say: 'O' Allah send prayers upon Muhammad and the family of Muhammad, just as You sent prayers upon Ebraheem and the family of Ebraheem. Verily, You are full of praise and majesty. O' Allah, send blessings upon Muhammad and the family of Muhammad, just as You sent blessings upon Ebraheem and upon the family of Ebraheem. Verily, You are full of praise and majesty."

Then Prophet Muhammad ﷺ taught them other forms of prayers upon him and his family, and one of the forms is: "O' Allah, send prayers upon Muhammad and upon the wives and descendants of Muhammad, just as you sent prayers upon the family of Ebraheem, and send blessings upon Muhammad and upon the wives and descendants of Muhammad, just as You sent blessings upon the family of Ebraheem. Verily, You are full of praise and majesty."

Although the wives of Prophet Muhammad ﷺ are named as Ahl Al-Bayt in the Ebraheemite Prayer, we would find a better and a clearer declaration that the wives of the Prophet are his household in this narration:

Anas bin Malik reported: "A banquet of bread and meat was held on the occasion of the marriage of the Prophet to Zainab bint Jahsh. I was sent to invite the people (to the banquet), The Prophet left and went towards the dwelling place of Aisha and said, "Peace and Allah's Mercy be on you, O the people of the house!" She replied, "Peace and the mercy of Allah be on you too. How did you find your wife? May Allah bless you. Then he went to the dwelling places of all his other wives and said to them the same as he said to Aisha and they said to him the same as Aisha had said to him." (Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Tafseer Al-Quran, Surat Al-Ahzab), (Al-Nisa'ei, Work of the day and night, 271)

In the hadeeth of Al-Efk (the narration of the Lie), the Prophet ﷺ while he was on the pulpit narrating charges of adultery from Ubaydillah bin Abi Salool against the Mother of Believers, Aisha, says: "O people give me your opinion regarding those people who made a forged story against my family. By Allah, I do not know anything bad about her. By Allah, they accused her of being with a man about whom I have never known anything bad, and he never entered my house unless I was present there, and whenever I went on a journey, he went with me" (Saheeh Al-Bukhari, Tafseer AL-Quran, Surat AL-Nour)

Now, let us see what language has to say about this issue. Arabic Language scholars are very clear in identifying the wives of a man as his household. Ibn Manthoor says in the Tongue of the Arabs (Lisan Al-Arab): "Ahl Al-Bayt: its dwellers, Ahl Al-Rajul (family of a man) is the closest people to him, and the household of Prophet Muhammad may Allah have peace on him is his wives, his daughters, and his son-in-law who is Ali bin Abi Talib"

Al-Fayrooz Al-A'abadi says in Qamoos Al-Muheet: "Ahl Al-Amr is its rulers, Ahl Al-Bayt is its

dwellers, Ahl Al-Mathhab (sect) is its who believe in it, Ahl Al-Rajul is his wife, and Ahl Al-Nabi is his wives, his daughters, and his son-in-law i.e. Ali may Allah be pleased of him.”

Al-Zubaydi says in Taj Al-Aroos (The Bride's Crown): “Ahl Al-Mathhab is its believers, Ahl Al-Rajul is his wife and children, and this is how the verse: “and was travelling with his family” is explained as his wives and family. Ahl Al-Nabi is his wives, daughters, and his son-in-law Ali. It was said that the descendant of a man is Ahl Al-Rajul. In the Quran: “Enjoin prayer on thy family, and be constant therein,” “And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye Members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless,” and “let mercy of Allah and His blessings be upon you Ahl Al-Bayt, He is the most benign and most exalted.”

In addition to the Prophetic narrations and to the Arabic Language scholars' sayings, the Quran itself testifies that wives are included in the phrase “Ahl A-Bayt.”

The Quran called Prophets' wives as their household. Allah says: “so he said to his family, “Tarry ye; I perceive a fire; perhaps I can bring you some burning brand therefrom, or find some guidance at the fire”. And it is known that only Mousa's wife was with him and no one else.

In the story of Zaleekha, the wife of Al-Azeez, when she wanted to temp Yousif, Allah says: “She said: “What is the (fitting) punishment for one who formed an evil design against thy family, but prison or agrievous chastisement?”

Also, Allah says: “Now when Moses had fulfilled the term, and was travelling with his family.” Al-Qumi says in his Tafseer: “When the time had come, Mousa took his wife, Shu'ayb provided Mousa, and Mousa lead his goats. When Mousa wanted to leave, Shu'ayb told him: “Go, Allah made it privately for you.” Therefore, Mousa lead his goats aiming Egypt. Mousa and his wife were in a place when a cold breeze, wind and darkness stroked Mousa and his family. Then, Mousa saw a fire, where Allah said the verse: “Now when Moses had fulfilled the term, and was travelling with his family.”

Included in the term “Ahl Al-Bayt” are Ali, Al-Hasan, Al-Hussain, and Fatima, may Allah be pleased with them all as it is mentioned in Hadeeth Al-Kisa'a (the narration of the cloak) that is narrated by Muslim. The mother of Believers, Aisha says: “One day, the messenger of Allah left the house at the afternoon and he was wearing a cloak. Then Hasan bin Ali came and the Prophet took him under his cloak. Next Hussain bin Ali came and the Prophet took him under his cloak. After that Fatima came and the Prophet took her under his cloak. Finally, Ali came, and the Prophet took him under his cloak. Then the Prophet said: “And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye Members of the Family, and to make you pure and spotless”

In retrospect, it is cleared that the household of Prophet Muhammad are his wives, the family of Ali (Hasan, Hussain, and Fatima), the family of Aqeel, the family of Abbas, and the family of Jaffar. Those are the ones who Prophet Muhammad ordered us to dignify and respect. Hadeeth Al-Thiqlain did not testify to the infallibility of anyone of them, but raised their status. Using the verse of Purification and hadeeth Al-Kisa'a to prove Ali's infallibility is non-sense. We prove that in another article under the title “[The purification verse & Hadeeth Al-kisa'a A Scientific Dialogue.](#)” Please refer to it.

Fadak Area Between Abu Baker And Fatimah

By Muhammad Al-Khider

FADAK is a hamlet in Hijaz that used to be inhabited by a group of Jews. After Rasulullah ﷺ had accomplished the conquest of Khaybar, Allah cast fear into the hearts of those Jews. They therefore conclude a treaty with Rasulullah ﷺ in terms of which Fadak was ceded to him. Thus, not having been conquered by force of arms, it became the personal property of Rasulullah ﷺ.

The difference between the Khalifah Abu Bakr and Sayyidah Fatimah was an acceptable difference in which either side had an opinion founded on proof. However, sensitivity towards the person of Sayyiduna Abu Bakr has led some people to view the issue out of its proper perspective, with the result that an anthill was transformed into a mountain.

To illustrate this with an example: if we had to substitute the two sides in this dispute—Sayyiduna Abu Bakr and Sayyidah Fatimah—with two Shi'i jurists, or two of the Maraji' of the Shi'ah, each side would be seen to retain the dignity of his position, and no vehement criticism would be directed at either side. The position of both disputants would then be viewed with equal respect and appreciation, in consideration of the fact that both persons base their claims upon textual evidence and proof, albeit that one of the two opinions would ultimately take precedence over the other.

However, when it comes to Abu Bakr and Fatimah there is a complete change of attitude. To the Shi'ah Abu Bakr is the enemy, and for as long as he be the enemy he will be considered evil incarnate, and error is inseparable from any of his judgements. Thus it is that sentiments have become the standard by which matters such as this are judged. Sentiments do not qualify as a standard to judge by even in trivial disputes. What remains then to be said for the use of sentiments as a criterion in the study of history and the formulation of religious precepts from it?

To the unbiased observer—who does not submit to sentiment, but yields only to the Truth, wherever it is might be—this is an issue that must be approached tentatively.

The status of Fadak

The land of Fadak can be only one of two things:

- I It was either INHERITED by Fatimah from Rasulullah ﷺ,
- I or it was a GIFT given to her by Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wasallam on the day of Khaybar.

AS INHERITANCE

Its status as inheritance is contained in the report documented by al-Bukhari, Muslim and others, wherein it is stated that

after the demise of Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam, Fatimah came to Abu Bakr requesting her inheritance from the Nabi ﷺ 'alayhi wasallam, from Fadak, his share in Khaybar, and other places. Abu Bakr said: "I heard Rasulullah ﷺ saying, 'We do not leave inheritance. What we leave behind is charity.' " ([Sahih Muslim](#), Kitab al-Jihad was-Siyar, no. 49)

The same reported in [Musnad Ahmad](#) reads:

We, the Prophets, do not leave heirs. ([Musnad Ahmad](#), vol. 2 p. 462)

Fatimah [radiyallahu 'anha](#) became displeased with Abu Bakr, since she viewed the issue in the general scope of the verse, “Allah directs you in (the matter of the inheritance of) your children: to the male a portion twice the portion of the female.” (Surah an-Nisa:11)

At this point, let us be neutral, and let us forget that the person requesting her inheritance is a personality whom we love and respect because she is the daughter of our Prophet, and that she has that revered position both within our hearts and with Allah. Let us say: The words of Muhammad ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam takes precedence over the words of anyone else. Therefore, if a hadith like this is authentic, what reason have we to lay blame at the door of Abu Bakr for following the dictates of the hadith and for applying it in practice?

The fact of the matter is that the hadith “We, the Prophets do not leave heirs” is authentic by both the Ahl as-Sunnah and the Shi'ah. Why is it then that Abu Bakr is condemned for appropriating an authentic statement of Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam, and that he be accused of fabricating the hadith in order to dispossess Fatimah of Fadak?

With the Ahl as-Sunnah the authenticity of the hadith by the Ahl as-Sunnah is in no need of clarification. The following section clarifies the authenticity of the hadith in the sources of the Shi'ah and by their standards.

Authenticity of the hadith

Al-Kulayni narrates in [al-Kafi](#):

Abu 'Abdillah (Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq) says that Rasulullah ﷺ said: “... And the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya; and the Ambiya did not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance; but they left knowledge. Therefore whosoever takes knowledge has taken a great portion.” ([al-Kafi](#), vol. 1 p. 42)

Regarding the authenticity of this hadith, 'Allamah Muhammad Baqir Majlisi states in his commentary on [al-Kafi](#), entitled [Mir'at al-Uqul](#):

[This] hadith has two chains of narration. The first is [majhul](#) [contains an unknown narrator], and the second is [hasan](#) or [muwaththaq](#). [Together] they do not fall short of being [sahih](#). ([Mir'at al-Uqul](#), vol. 1 p. 111)

It is then a fact that this hadith is reliable. Why do the 'ulama of the Shi'ah refrain from using it, despite the fact that it so well-known in their ranks?

The strange thing here is that the hadith is authentic enough for Khomeini to utilise it as evidence of the validity of his monumental political theory of [Wilayat al-Faqih](#) (the Rule of the Jurisprudent). He writes under the heading “[Sahihat al-Qaddah](#)” (the authentic narration of al-Qaddah):

'Ali ibn Ibrahim narrates from his father, from Hammad ibn 'Isa, on the authority of ['Abdullah ibn Maymun] al-Qaddah that Abu 'Abdillah [Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq] 'alayhis salam said: Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alihi wasallam said: “Whoever walks a path seeking therein knowledge, Allah will lead him on a road to Jannah... And the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya; and the Ambiya did not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance; but they left knowledge. Therefore whosoever takes knowledge has taken a great portion.” ([al-Kafi](#), Kitab Fadl al-'Ilm, Bab Sifat al-'Ilm wa-Fadlihi, hadith no. 2)

To this narration Khomeini appends the following remark:

The narrators of this tradition are all reliable and trustworthy. The father of 'Ali ibn Ibrahim [namely Ibrahim ibn Hashim] is not only reliable; he is one of the most reliable and trustworthy narrators. ([al-Hukumat al-Islamiyyah](#), p. 133, published by Markaz Baqiyyat Allah al-A'zam, Beirut)

Thereafter Khomeini points to another narration to the same effect that is recorded in [al-Kafi](#) with a weak chain of narration, and comments as follows:

This narration has been narrated with a slight difference to the same effect through another chain of narration that is weak, meaning that the chain is authentic up to Abul Bakhtari, but Abul Bakhtari himself is weak. That narration is as follows:

[It is narrated] from Muhammad ibn Yahya, from Ahmad ibn Muhammad ibn 'Isa, from Muhammad ibn Khalid, from Abul Bakhtari, that Abu 'Abdillah [Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq] ['alayhis salam](#) said: "Verily the 'Ulama are the heirs of the Ambiya. That is because the Ambiya do not leave dirhams or dinars as inheritance, but they leave their words." . ([al-Hukumat al-Islamiyyah](#), p. 133)

It might be concluded from the above that the hadith which states that "the Ambiya do not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance, but they leave knowledge" is authentic in one of its two chains of narration, as attested to by Khomeini, and before him by Majlisi. Why should an authentically narrated statement of Rasulullah ﷺ be spurned when it is a matter of consensus that there can be no Ijtihad when a Nass (text) exists? Again, why does this hadith qualify to be used in support of [Wilayat al-Faqih](#), but not for the issue of Fadak? Is this issue being judged subjectively?

The prayer of Zakariyya

The argument in favour of the Ambiya leaving inheritance that appropriates as proof the words of Zakariyya ['alayhis salam](#) in Surah Maryam "Grant me from Your side an heir who will inherit me and inherit the posterity of Ya'qub" is a pathetic argument that lacks logic in every respect. That is for the following reasons:

- 1 It is not fit or proper for a pious man to ask Allah for an heir to inherit his possessions. How can it then be found acceptable that a noble prophet like Zakariyya ['alayhis salam](#) asked Allah for a son to inherit his wealth? What Zakariyyah ['alayhis salam](#) really asked for was a son who would bear aloft the standard of Prophethood after him, and in whom the legacy of the progeny of Ya'qub would continue.
- 1 It is well known that Zakariyya ['alayhis salam](#) was a poor man who earned his living as a carpenter. What wealth could he have had that would prompt him to request an heir from Allah? In fact, it was a general rule with the Ambiya that they did not hoard anything beyond their need, and that they spent any surplus in charity.
- 1 The word [al-irth](#) (inheritance) does not refer to material possessions exclusively. It is also used to denote knowledge, prophethood or sovereignty. Examples of such usage are found in Surah Fatir:32, where Allah says: "Thereafter We gave the Book as inheritance ([awrathna](#)) to such of Our servants as We have chosen"; and in Surah al-Mu'minun:10-11, where Allah says: "Those are the Inheritors ([al-warithun](#)) who will inherit Paradise."

- 1 The aforementioned hadith which states that “the Ambiya do not leave dinars and dirhams as inheritance, but they leave knowledge” explicitly negates the possibility of the Ambiya leaving a material legacy as inheritance. This alone is sufficient proof.

Sulayman as the heir of Dawud

The same is applicable to the argument in which the verse “And Sulayman inherited Dawud” (an-Naml:16) is used as proof that the Ambiya do leave a material inheritance. The inheritance in this case was not of material possessions. Rather, it was of prophethood, wisdom and knowledge. This is proven by the following two facts:

- 1 It is well known that Dawud [‘alayhis salam](#) had 100 wives and 300 concubines. He had numerous children from these wives and concubines. If this verse is assumed to speak of the inheritance of material possessions, why is Sulayman mentioned as the sole heir?
- 1 If this verse is assumed to speak of material inheritance there does not remain much sense for it being mentioned in the Qur’an, since it is then reduced to an ordinary and trivial matter. “Material inheritance is not something laudable, neither to Dawud nor to Sulayman [‘alayhimas salam](#). Even a Jew or Christian inherits the material possessions of his father. The purpose of this verse is to extol the excellence of Sulayman and to make mention of that which was granted specifically to him. Inheriting material possessions is an ordinary and trivial matter that is common to everyone, like eating, drinking and burying the dead. This is not the kind of thing that would be mentioned about the Ambiya, since it is simply inconsequential. Only such things would be related about the Ambiya which carry lessons or benefit. Things like ‘He died, and his son inherited his property,’ or ‘They buried him,’ or ‘They ate and drank slept’ is not the kind of information that would be conveyed in the stories of the Qur’an.” ([Mukhtasar Minhaj as-Sunnah](#), vol. 1 p. 240, with minor adjustments)

A Woman’s Inheritance

A more astounding revelation—of which many people happen to be uninformed—is the fact that in the Fiqh of the Imami Shi’ah a woman does not inherit land or fixed property. How is it that the Shi’ah accept it for Sayyidah Fatimah [radiyallahu ‘anha](#) to inherit Fadak, when their own jurisprudence does not allow the succession of a woman to land or fixed property?

- 1 In [al-Kafi](#) al-Kulayni has included a chapter entitled “Women do not inherit land”. In this chapter he narrates a hadith from Imam Muhammad al-Baqir, “Women do not inherit anything of land or fixed property.” ([al-Kafi](#), vol. 7 p. 127, Kitab al-Mawarith, hadith no. 1)
- 1 Al-Tusi in [Tahdhib al-Ahkam](#), and al-Majlisi in [Bihar al-Anwar](#) have narrated from Maysarah that he asked Imam Ja’far as-Sadiq about what a woman inherits. The Imam replied: “They will get the value of the bricks, the building, the wood and the bamboo. As for the land and the fixed property, they will get no inheritance from that.” ([Tahdhib al-Ahkam](#), vol. 9 p. 299; [Bihar al-Anwar](#), vol. 104 p. 351)

- 1 Al-Tusi records in [Tahdhib al-Ahkam](#) and [al-Istibsar](#) from Muhammad ibn Muslim that Imam Muhammad al-Baqir said: "A woman will not inherit anything of land and fixed property." ([Tahdhib al-Ahkam](#), vol. 9 p. 298; [al-Istibsar](#), vol. 4 p. 152)
- 1 He also records from 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yan that either Imam Muhammad al-Baqir or Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq said: "Women will have nothing of houses or land." ([Tahdhib al-Ahkam](#), vol. 9 p. 299; [Bihar al-Anwar](#), vol. 104 p. 351)

In addition, if Fadak had to be inheritance, the wives of Rasulullah ﷺ like 'A'ishah, and his daughters like Zaynab and Umm Kulthum would have had a share in it. However, Abu Bakr, for the sake of the hadith, did not give anything of it to the wives or daughters of Rasulullah ﷺ, not even to his own daughter 'A'ishah. Why are the wives and the other daughters of Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alih wasallam not mentioned as parties in the dispute over Fadak, and why is all attention focused only on Sayyidah Fatimah?

FADAK AS A GIFT

All of the above concerns the status of Fadak as inheritance from Rasulullah ﷺ. On the other hand, if it is maintained that Fadak was a gift from Rasulullah ﷺ—as claimed by al-Kashani in his tafsir, [as-Safi](#) (vol. 3 p. 186)—the matter needs to be looked into.

This claim is first and foremost contradicted by authentic reports of both the Ahl as-Sunnah and the Shi'ah which state that Sayyidah Fatimah [radiyallahu 'anha](#) requested Fadak as her inheritance from Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alih wasallam. However, even if this claim is assumed to be an authentic, we still cannot accept it. We cannot accept it since it is diametrically opposed to the precept of parental fairness to children espoused by Islam.

The Sahabi Bashir ibn Sa'd came to Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alih wasallam, telling him that he had given one of his sons a garden as a gift, and requesting Rasulullah ﷺ to be witness thereto. Rasulullah ﷺ asked whether he had given a similar gift to all of his children. When he replied in that he had not in fact done so, Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alih wasallam told him, "Go away, for I will not be a witness to injustice." ([Sahih Muslim](#), Kitab al-Hibat, no. 14)

Rasulullah ﷺ denounced the act of giving one child more than the other as injustice. Is it then at all plausible that one such as he, as an infallible Nabi who refuses to be witness to injustice, would himself perpetrate that injustice? Is it imaginable that he, who is entrusted with the Trust of the Heavens, could breach a mundane trust of this world by giving Fadak as a gift to Fatimah alone amongst all his daughters? We all know that Khaybar was taken in the 7th year after the Hijrah, and that Zaynab died in the 8th year, and Umm Kulthum in the 9th year after the Hijrah. How can it then be thought that Rasulullah ﷺ would give something to Fatimah but not to his other daughters?

In any event, what is reliably contained in the documented reports is that when Sayyidah Fatimah requested Fadak, she requested it as her inheritance, and not as a gift that was given to her by Rasulullah ﷺ 'alayhi wa-alih wasallam.

CONCLUSION

It is therefore concluded that Fadak was neither inheritance nor a gift. This was exactly the position of Imam 'Ali. When he became the Khalifah he did not treat Fadak as the estate of his deceased wife Sayyidah Fatimah, by taking a quarter for himself and distributing the remaining three quarters between , Husayn and Umm Kulthum according to the rule "to the male twice the share of the female". This is an established fact of history. Why is Abu Bakr execrated for something which was also done by 'Ali? In fact, Sayyid Murtada (known as 'Alam al-Huda) narrates in his book on Imamah entitled [ash-Shafi](#), that when 'Ali became the khalifah he was approached about returning Fadak.

His reply was: "I am ashamed before Allah to overturn something that was prohibited by Abu Bakr and continued by 'Umar." (al-Murtada, [ash-Shafi fil-Imamah](#), p. 231; and Ibn Abil Hadid, [Sharh Nahj al-Balaghah](#), vol. 4)

I was on the verge of closing the file on the Fadak issue and a discussion of the various arguments issue when my eye fell on a narration which throws light upon the condition of those who are bent upon finding fault with Abu Bakr, by whichever means they can, legitimate or illegitimate.

Al-Kulayni narrates in [al-Kafi](#):

Abul Hasan [Imam 'Ali ar-Rida] came to [the 'Abbasid khalifah] al-Mahdi and saw him redressing grievances and returning property to its owners that was unrightfully appropriated. He [Imam Rida] asked, "What about our grievance? Why is it not returned?" Al-Mahdi asked. "And what might that be, Abul Hasan?" He replied, "When Allah granted his Prophet the conquest of Fadak..." Al-Mahdi asked, "Abul Hasan, describe to me the extent of this property." He [Imam Rida] replied, "One side of it is Mount Uhud. Another side is al-'Arish in Egypt. Another side is the coastline. Another side is Dawmat al-Jandal." ([al-Kafi](#), Bab al-Fay' wal-Anfal, vol. 1 p. 543; also [Bihar al-Anwar](#), vol. 48 p. 156)

How can a piece of land in Khaybar possibly fit this description? Is this the extent to which people will allow themselves to be duped and deceived?

[EXPLANATORY NOTE: [Mount Uhud](#), of course, is in Madinah. This is given as the south-eastern point. The north-eastern point is stated to be Dawmat al-Jandal, a location close to the Saudi-Jordanian border. Al-'Arish lies in Egypt, on the edge of the Sinai desert. It is given as the north-western point. The western boundary is stated as the western coastline of the Arabian peninsula. The area described here corresponds roughly to the area lying between latitudes 25 and 30, and longitudes 35 and 40. It is the entire north western quarter of the Arabian peninsula, and is twice as large as modern Jordan.]

Hadith Of Kisa'

A Scientific Dialogue

By Muhammad Al-Khider

Allah Almighty says in the Holy Qur'an :

“And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former times of ignorance: and establish regular prayer, and give regular charity, and obey Allah and His Messenger. And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the family, and to make you pure and spotless.” **Quran 33 : 33**

It was narrated by 'Aisha (May Allah be pleased with her) that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ once went out in the morning suspending a cloth over his hair; When he saw Al-Hasan ibn 'Ali appearing, he hid it ,then came Hussein and entered with him.When 'Ali and his spouse Fatima came, he hid it and said:

“ And Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the family, and to make you pure and spotless.” **Quran (33:33)**

The Shi'ite adherents claim that all members of the household of the Prophet and their posterity are infallible. And thus, it is a must to obey them.; For they deserve to be Imams. They do support their claim categorically with the above mentioned Qur'anic verse and the Prophetic Tradition. How true is their claim?

Commentary:

Indeed the purification verse was revealed in favor of the Prophet's wives, as God Almighty stated in the Holy Qur'an:

“ O consorts of the Prophet! You are not like any of the (other) women. If you do fear (Allah), be not too complaisant of speech, lest one in whose heart is a disease should be moved with desire: but speak ye a speech (that is) just.”

“ And stay quietly in your houses, and make not a dazzling display, like that of the former times of ignorance: and establish regular prayer, and give regular charity,and obey Allah and His Messenger. Ang Allah only wishes to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the family and to make you pure and spotless.”

“ And recite what is rehearsed to you in your homes of the signs of Allah and His wisdom: For allah understands the finest mysteries and is well-acquainted (with them) “ **Quran 33:32-34**

So, whoever ponders these verses with a clear and objective mind, without prejudice will come to a conclusion that they were revealed exclusively in favor of the Prophet's Consorts. Moreover, if one fathoms the verse: “ **Stay quietly in your house.....** will find out that, it is only one verse and the Messenger's wives are the only ones addressed therein.

This might lead us to question ourselves: If the verse addressed only the wives of the Prophet ﷺ, why didn't it contain a feminine pronoun of (Meem) instead of using an article implying plural of men? It should be clear that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was the head of his household. So, in order to include him, it was incumbent to use the article "Meem" that denotes talking about a group of men. For he was a man and a leader of his household. For more explanation of this, we should refer to the verse wherein Allah talks about Prophet Ibraahim (Pbuh).

“ They said: Do you wonder of Allah's decree? The grace of Allah and His blessings on you, oh ye people of the house ! For He is indeed worthy of all praise, full of glory.” **Quran 11 : 73**

Since Abraham was also included in his family, the Holy Qur'an addressed his wife using masculine plural of men with the article "Meem" as it is customary in the Arabic grammar. For the plural of men is applied even though there is only one man in the group of females according to the classical Arabic. Moreover, in Arabic, a wife is addressed as "Ahl", which also means "People" as revealed in the verse wherein Allah almighty was talking about Prophet Moses sa

Allah Almighty says : " Now when Moses had fulfilled the term, and was travelling with his family..." **Quran 28 : 29**

So, what do you find strange if this verse was addressed solely to the wives of the Prophet (Pbuh), though the article of masculine plural was applied ?!

2. What proves that this verse was revealed solely for the wives of the Prophet ﷺ, is the Prophetic Tradition itself. In this regard, Prophet Muhammad ﷺ prayed for his close relatives, including his in-laws and said: (O Allah! Those are also members of my family, O Allah purify them.)

Suppose the verse was addressed to them, confirming that Allah had purified them, why could the Prophet ﷺ need to invoke Allah Almighty to include this kith and kin in the purification promise ?!!

3. The household of the Messenger of Allah s includes his wives, Imam Ali, Lady Fatima, the two Imams Al-Hasan and Al-Hussein, and Zaid ibn Al-Arqam who was asked about the household of the Prophet and said in the Hadith: (His spouses are a fibre of his household). He went further to explain that his household includes also the people who were not allowed to receive any charity namely: the relatives of Ali, the kindred of Ja'afar, the family of Aqeel, and the kinsfolk of Al-Abbas. Therefore, the concept of the Prophet's household encompasses also Al-Abbas- the son Abdul Muttalib, the kith and kin of ' Aqeel bin abi Talib, and the family of Ja'afar bin Abi Talib, as stated in the Tradition (Hadith) of Zaid bin Al-Arqaam. It also includes the family of Al-Harith bin Abdul Muttalib, due to what the Messenger s told Rabbea bin Al-Harith and Al-Abbas bin Abdil Muttalib: (Verily , the family of Muhammad does not deserve any charity , for it is people's filth) **Sahih Muslim**

Even though, we accept the infallibility of the Shi'ite Imams, we will come to a conclusion that it is not logical or Substantial for a non-prophet to be infallible whatsoever he may be.

4. Referring to the above mentioned verse, and deducting therefrom that Allah's purification from abomination was meant also for the in-laws and the entire kith and kin of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, prompts a person to wonder and get surprised. The reason for that is self-evident and palpable for everybody.

The aforementioned Hadeeth mentions Fatima (the daughter of the prophet May Allah be pleased with her) as part and parcel of the people who were meant for purification among the family members of the Prophet ﷺ

The Imamite Shi'ah claim that Allah Almighty granted the Shi'ite Imams infallibility because the task they were to be assigned to undertake required of them to be so. The task they were to undertake was to lead people and to apply the Divine Laws of Allah Almighty in Judging among mankind. Now the question casts itself, suppose what they claim is correct, is Lady Fatima (May Allah be pleased with her) a prophet or an Imam to be infallible?! Why she should be infallible if she is not a prophet or an Imam (like how shia believe) ?!!

Allah Almighty bestowed the attribute of infallibility on the Prophets and Messengers because they had a task ahead of them that was to convey the message revealed to them to their respective peoples and to safeguard the supernatural message they were entrusted with by Allah Almighty.

5. Since the purification verse was revealed in regard to the wives of the Allah's Messenger and Allah Almighty affirmed to make them pure and spotless, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ gathered his closest kith and kin and invoked Allah Almighty to purify them as promised his wives (Prophet's).

He thus said in his supplication: (O Allah ! those are my kith and kin, remove all abomination from them and make them pure and spotless). So after Umm Salama saw that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had included Ali, Fatima, Al-Hasan and Al-Hussein in the members of his household, she requested him earnestly to include her among the people he supplicated for. The Messenger of Allah informed her undoubtedly that there was no need for him to include her among his kith and kin since she was one of his wives, and the verse was revin their regard. This is a sound evidence that states categorically the fact that the verse was not revealed in regard of the Prophet's kith and kin but rather it was addressing his wives. Had it been addressing also his kith and kin there would be no need for him to gather his daughter, son -in-law and his grandsons to invoke Allah to include them among his spouses who were promised to be purified.

6. In the verse: " And Allah wishes only to remove all abomination from you, ye members of the family, and to make you pure and spotless." Allah's statement was not to assure them that they had already been purified, but rather to stipulate a condition that if they obeyed Him, He would remove all abomination from them and thus purify them. He only wished to purify them if they met this Condition.

If you analyze the context, you will find that Allah Almighty was giving the prophet's wives some divine directions to do all what He commanded them and to abstain from what He forbade. He thus informed them that if they Conformed to his commands and abstained from what he forbade, He would reward them by removing all abomination from them and make them pure and stainless.

It should be noted that God Almighty has used this pattern of speech to address our predecessors. Consider the following verse:

" Allah does not wish to place you in a difficulty, but to make you clean, and to complete his favor upon you , that ye may be grateful." **Quran 5 : 6**

In another verse, He thus says: "Allah does wish to make clear to you and to show you the ordinances of those before you." **Quran 4 : 26**

He also says: " Allah does wish to lighten your (difficulties): For man was created weak (in flesh). " **Quran 4 : 28**

The wish of Allah expressed in the above mentioned verses comes as a condition of being loyal to His commands, to love Him and make Him pleased with you. Otherwise, without fulfilling this condition, His wish cannot come into reality, i.e the purification cannot occur.

7. The main aim of the Prophet ﷺ in his aforementioned Hadeeth was to pray for his kith and kin to get all their abomination removed from them by Allah, and to be purified as well. This implies that he

prayed for them to be among the pious believers who were purified by Allah Almighty. Hence, avoiding abomination is a must for all the believers. For Allah Almighty wishes to purify all the believers who subscribe only to Him in their acts of devotion and not only the family of the Prophet ﷺ. Although the Prophet's kith and kin are more entitled to get the purification of Allah Almighty, the verse does not restrict Allah's purification to them only, to be regarded as impeccable. Allah Almighty says:

“ Allah does not wish to place you in a difficulty, but to make you clean and to complete His favour to you, that ye may be grateful.” **Quran 5 : 6**

In another verse, God Almighty says: “ For Allah loves those who turn to Him constantly in repentance and loves also those who keep themselves pure and clean.” **Quran 2 : 222**

So, as Allah Almighty told us of His wish to purify members of the prophet's family, He so informed us of His wish to purify the believers as well. Therefore, if we suppose that the wish of Allah to purify the believers was meant to make them impeccable, then all sincere pious believers are infallible.

8. The purification mentioned in the aforementioned verse was not meant to make the kith and kin of the Messenger of Allah infallible, but rather to remove all abomination and mischief from them. This style is widely used in the Holy Qur'an. We read in the Holy Qur'an:

“ Of their goods take alms, so that ye might purify them and sanctify them.....”
Quran 9 : 103

You will never find anybody say that the purification mentioned in the afore-mentioned verses was meant to make the Prophet's family members infallible. We also read in the Holy Qur'an:

“ And thy garments keep thee from stain..... “ **Quran 74 : 4**

This is mentioned in many verses of the holy Qur'an. The stain here implies filth and dirt. By this Allah Almighty alludes to polytheism (Shirk). To substantiate this explanation and interpretation, Allah Almighty says in the Holy Qur'an:

“..... But shun the abomination of idols ...” **Quran 22:30**

Also the word stain may mean , the forbidden foods and drinks as Allah has plainly stated:

“ Say: I find not in the message received by me by inspiration any (meal) forbidden to be eaten by one who wishes to eat it unless it be dead meat, or blood poured forth, or the flesh of swine, for it is an abomination or what is impious, (meat) “ **Quran 6 : 145**

Another example is the following verse;

“ O ye who believe! Most certainly, intoxicants and gambling, (dedication) of stones and (divination by) arrows, are an abomination of Satans handiwork, eschew such (abomination), that ye may prosper.” **Quran 5 : 90**

There is no verse however, in the Holy Qur'an that refers to “stain” as to mean sins. For if it means sins, then the verse of purification came to confirm that those of the prophetic family were infallible from committing sins.

9. The verse does not whatsoever mean that purification has already taken place, but it rather asserts explicitly the will of Allah Almighty to purify the Staunch and sincere wives of the prophet ﷺ

From the previous argument, we also deduct that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was eager to pray for his immediate and other relatives to be included in the verse of purification, in order to achieve the same as his spouses were promised.

Worthy of mention, is that whenever the Messenger Of Allah went to perform the daily obligatory prayer, he used to pass by the house of his cousin and son-in-law, Ali and his spouse Fatima, reminding them of the obligation of prayer by saying:

(Stick to the mandatory prayers, O members of the family!)

After this exhortation, he used to recite to them the following verse :

“ Allah so wills to remove all abomination from you O members of the family, and to make you pure and stainless.”

As stated before in the same verse. By this, he was reminding them, especially Ali, of performing Obligatory prayers in congregation in the mosque. For if one observes all obligatory acts of worship and obey Allah fully, then his reward will be to purify him from all abomination and stains.

10. If we presume that the purification verse was revealed only to address the relatives of the Prophet ﷺ and not his spouses, so the purification stated in the verse does not suit them, due to following Qur'anic text in which Allah Almighty says: “ But He so will to purify you and complete His favors on you.” He so addresses His servants in so many other Qur'anic verses. So, if the aim of Allah Almighty in purifying the spouses of the Prophet ﷺ was to make them infallible, it would necessitate us to say that all the believers are infallible, following the Qur'anic verse which states that Allah Almighty so Wills to purify them. I am pretty sure that neither the Sunnis nor the Shi'as can allege that analogy. So how can the purification theory be executed in respect of some sects of people and leave others out of bound? Can't you see that in this preposition, there is some whimsical and temperamental inclination? There is no any scientific methodology in it.

It is surprising that the Shi'ite Scholars cling to the purification verse and allege that it was revealed with regard to the relatives of the Prophet ﷺ, leaving out anything that deals with the purification. By this, they claim that only the relatives of the Prophet ﷺ are infallible. They thus intend to forget other verses that Allah Almighty revealed to purify the companions the Holy Prophet ﷺ from all abomination. We read for example.” But He so wishes to purify you and complete His favor on you.” They besides, slander the rightly guided Companions of the Holy Prophet ﷺ and allege that they will be caused to turn upside down as a punishment for them. They claim this, inspite of the fact that Allah Almighty confirmed His Will to purify the sincere Companions of the Holy Prophet. You find many parities in the assumptions of the Shi'ite Scholars, that cause you to shake your head incessantly and come to a conclusion that, it is not but bigotry towards their Sect and utter hatred of the rightly guided Companions of the Holy Prophet ﷺ

11. To remove abomination from the kith and kin of the Prophet ﷺ does not entitle them to be Imams. Now we are on the outset of looking for an evidence either from the Holy Qur'an or from the Hadith that confirms the religious leadership of the Prophet's relatives. If it is said that among the pre-requisites of the Imamite is to be infallible, then the following question casts itself; What do you say regarding Fatima bin Muhammad, who was among his daughters and among the relatives who included in the purification verse? Can we enforce the same principle on her and regard her as one of the Imam? If they say no, then we should cast the following question; which is matter of factly a quotation from a lengthy Qur'anic verse “ Do you only believe in some portions of the book (i.e. Qur'an) and disbelieve in the others? ” You should either implement what you claim totally or admit its futility. But tampering with the Qur'anic verses and trying to fix them in some places to suit your desires without objectivity, is in fact, playing about with the Holy Book of Allah! May Allah forbid!

However, I don't think that whoever follows the path of claiming the infallibility of the kith and kin of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, is committing less than bigotry and sticks to the wrong notions and assumptions, and wrongly or intentionally misunderstands the Holy Book of Allah. May Allah Almighty help us and save us from such dissimulators and hypocrites.

Integrity Of The Prophet's Companions

By Muhammad Alkhider

Some people intentionally or unintentionally do refer to the meaning of Integrity and the concept of Infallibility as synonymous, although the difference between them is crystal-clear. As such, they think that attributing virtuousness to the companions of the Holy Prophet necessitates their infallibility. What a grave mistake!

Integrity of the Prophet's companions means that: they were neither hypocrites, liars, lewd, immoral nor infidels. Besides, they were righteous believers who would err sometimes and correct their mistakes thereafter. They committed mistakes after which they hastened to repent and seek forgiveness from Allah Almighty. They obeyed God, the Most High, and expected His acceptance of their acts of devotion without an iota of doubt.

Infallibility requires of a person to be exalted from committing sins or perpetuating shortcomings. Both his mind and body should be immaculate of blemishes and shortcomings that can easily defame his rank and traduce his status.

The difference between Integrity and Infallibility is crystal-clear in Islam. The Sunni Muslims do refer to the companions of the Holy Prophet as straightforward, virtuous and honest but not infallible. Impeccability according to the belief of the Sunni Muslims is only attributed to Prophets and Messenger of God Almighty.

Regarding the source of integrity and the question whether it is a Philosophical theory or rather an Islamic fact that a host of texts has proved authentic, the answer is as follows:

A pondering and reflecting look at the Holy Qur'an and a study that Muslims render to the Book of God and the authentic traditions of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) is able to provide a convincing answer to the aforementioned question. Allah, the Holy One, says in the Holy Qur'an: **"Allah's good pleasure was on the believers when they swore Fealty to thee under the Tree: He knew what was in their hearts, and He sent down Tranquility to them: and He rewarded them with a speedy victory."** (48: 18)

God Almighty in the above-mentioned verse explained to His messenger and the entire believing folk that His pleasure was on the believers, men and women, who plighted fealty to Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). He informed his messenger furthermore that He knew what was concealed in their hearts regarding faith in Him and truthfulness. Hence, He sent down tranquility, peace, calm and sense of security and confidence to them. This suffices as testimony from God Almighty regarding the veracity of the companions' faith, their truthfulness and sincerity. It has been proven that the messenger of God (PBUH) said: **"No one among those who swore their fealty to me under the tree will be consigned to Hell except the owner of the red camel."** (Related by At-Tirmidhiy in "Al-Mana'iqib [Virtues of the Companions], and Muslim in the same titled book)

The man who was doomed to Hell-fire according to the above-mentioned Hadith, was among the arch-hypocrites of **Madinah** called **Al-Jaddu bin Qais**.

The number of the companions who swore their fealty to the Prophet (PBUH) was 1,400. According to other traditions it reached 1,500. God Almighty testified to their sincere and truthfulness and confirmed to His messenger that there was no grain of hypocrisy in their hearts except one man. The messenger of God (PBUH) eventually revealed his name to the companions. His name was **Al-**

Jaddu bin Qais. He did not swear his fealty to the messenger of God as did the companions under the Tree of Allah's Pleasure. Allah, Exalted in Might, says in the Holy Qur'an: **"Not equal among you are those who spent (freely) and fought before the victory (with those who did so later). Those are higher in rank than those who spent (freely) and fought afterwards. But to all has Allah promised a goodly (reward.)"** (57: 10)

God, the Most High, in the above-mentioned verse, promised the companions who spent freely before and after the speedy victory of the liberation of Makkah, a goodly reward. Moreover, He passed a verdict regarding the ones He promised a goodly reward, that they would be safe from the torment of the Hell-fire on the Resurrection Day. He says in the Holy Qur'an: **"Those for whom the good (record) from Us has gone before, will be removed far therefrom. Not the slightest sound will they hear of hell. What their souls desired, in that will they dwell. The Great Terror will bring them no grief."** (21: 101-103) Allah Almighty also says in the Holy Qur'an: **"Ye are the best of peoples, evolved for mankind, enjoining what is right, forbidding what is wrong, and believing in Allah."** (3: 110)

However, it is incredible for a nation (People) that Allah Almighty has referred to as the best of people evolved for mankind, as testimony from Him to be as the Shiite Adherents and Sources maintain! For they say: "The emigrants (from Makkah to **Madinah**) and the **Ansa'r** (those who welcomed, helped and hosted the Prophet and his companions who came from Makkah) all of them recanted their religion except three." (Al-Kaafiy, 2/244)

Had it been true that they were really as described by the Shiite Sources, Allah Almighty would have not praised and placed them in a lofty rank in the aforementioned verse and in many others. The messenger of God (PBUH) says: **"Prophet Noah (on him be peace) is going to be summoned by God Almighty on the Resurrection Day. He will say: "Here I am at your service O my Lord!" Then God Almighty will ask him: "Did you convey the message?" Noah's response will be: "Yes." Then God Almighty will ask Noah's people: "Did he convey the message?" They will apparently say: "No Warner came to us." Then God Almighty will ask Noah (Peace be upon him): "Who will testify that you conveyed the message?" Noah will obviously say: "Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and his people (followers)." Then the followers of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) will unanimously testify that Noah (on him be peace) delivered the message entrusted to him by God Almighty."**

Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) informed us of the aforementioned situation in his interpretation of the following verse: **"Thus have We made you an Ummah (nation, people) justly balanced, that ye might be witnesses over yourselves."** (2: 143)

Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) in the context of his interpretation of the aforementioned verse said: **"To be justly balanced means: to be straightforward."** Related by Al-Bukha'riy

Thus the messenger of God (PBUH) confirmed the non-shaky integrity of his honest, truthful and sincere companions.

Answering Shi'ism

Shi'ite see that Jews are better than Muslims:

This Ummah (nation) is the best among all nations. The best of this nation is the first generation (people at the time of the prophet ﷺ). Although those people are the most perfect people by their righteous follow to the Sunnah of the prophet ﷺ, Shia claimed that those people are kâfirs (disbelieves in Islam) and were not following the truth even though they knew it! Whereas since Allah said about Jews (after all the corruption that they did):

"Of the people of Moses there is a section who guide and do justice in the light of truth." (Qur'an 7:159)

And whereas none of this Ummah—as the Shia claim follow the truth—do justice in the light of truth, then Jews are better than Muslims! Clearly Jews and Christians respect their prophets more than the Râfida:

Imam Sha3bi asked the Jews: "who is the **best** among your nation?" They said: "the companions of Moses." Then he asked the Christians so they replied: "the apostles of Jesus." Then he asked the Râfida "who is the **worst** among your nation?" They said: "the Companions of Muhammad"

Obviously those Râfida are included in the meaning of this Ayah:

Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Book? They believe in Sorcery and Evil and say to the unbelievers that they are better guided in the (right) way than the Believers! They are those whom Allah has cursed, and he whom Allah curses, you will not find for him (any) helper (Qur'an 4:51)

Shia champion and assist Kafirs against Muslims:

When the Mongols invaded the Islamic world, Shia provided a strong support to them against Muslims. Shia helped the Christian crusaders against Muslims. When Jews established a state in north of Iraq, Shia were the greater supporters to them. Iran today supports al-Gaddafi (president of Libya) who is very anti-Islamic.

On the other hand, the Sunni Muslims (Ahl-us-Sunnah) are those who uphold the Qur'aan and the Hadeeth (Sunnah). It is through them that Allah has protected Islam. They are those who engaged in Jihad for the glory and dignity of Islam and established the glorious history of Islam.

Why Shia curse the wives of the prophet and his companions?

The one who curses the wives of the prophet and his companions is:

- 1 Either a irreligious anti-Islamic hypocrite who make a defamation against them as a way of slandering the prophet ﷺ and as a scheme to attack Islam. All the founders of the Shia's movements belong to this group. Note that not any one of Ahlul-Bayt belong to those Shia.
- 1 Or an inattentive who follows his act according to one's own wishes and ignorant. Almost all the Shia today belong to this group.

Remember that Abu-Bakr and Umar (may Allah be pleased with them) were the closest companions to Muhammad ﷺ as all references indicates and Allah confirmed in the Qur'an. His good treat to them is very well known to Shia. They were both fathers-in-law of the Prophet and his right hand.

So, if the Shia claim were correct then we have three possible situations:

- 1 Either they were hypocrites and the Prophet ﷺ did not know that. This is a great insult to Allah since he did not warn his Messenger from his closest companions.
- 1 Or they were hypocrites and the Prophet ﷺ knew that. This is even worst since they are insulting the Prophet ﷺ by claiming that he did not warn his nation from those hypocrites and he made them his relatives.
- 1 Or they were good Muslims and they went astray after his death. This is abandonment from Allah to his messenger since He did not tell him what would happen in the future to warn the Muslim Ummah. How come Allah who promised to support his religion and his messenger, make to closest companions to his prophet renegades and hypocrites?!

By insulting the wives and the companions of the Prophet ﷺ, clearly the Shia want people to say: "Muhammad was a wanton man among wanton companions. If he were a virtuous man then his companions will be virtuous people too." The Shia curse the Companions who are the righteous pattern to this Ummah and Allah bear witness for that:

(Some part is due) **to the indigent Muhajirs (the Companions who emigrated from Mecca), those who were expelled from their homes and their property, while seeking Grace from Allah and (His) Good Pleasure, and aiding Allah and His Messenger: such are indeed the sincere ones; But those who, before them, had homes (in Medina) and had adopted the Faith, show their affection to such as came to them for refuge, and entertain no desire in their hearts for things given to the (latter), but give them preference over themselves, even though poverty was their (own lot). And those saved from the covetousness of their own souls; they are the ones that achieve prosperity. And those who came after them say: "Our Lord! Forgive us, and our brethren who came before us into the Faith, and leave not, in our hearts, rancour (or sense of injury) against those who have believed. Our Lord! Thou art indeed Full of Kindness, Most Merciful." (Qur'an Hashr: 8-10)**

Contradiction in Shi'ism

Shia curses Abu-Bakr and his daughter Aisha, the wife of the prophet ﷺ, but they regard his son since he fought with Ali. So, they hate the best one in this Ummah after The Prophet and they regard his son who does not have any contribution in raising Islam.

Shia also **claim** that they love the family of the Prophet ﷺ, but they curse his wives who are the most important part of his family!

Why cursing the Companions (Sahâbah) of The Prophet ﷺ is very dangerous?

Because the Companions of The Prophet ﷺ are those who are denigrating and demolishing Islam. For, indeed, it is the Sahâbah (my Allah be pleased with them) who are the ones through whom Islam has been passed down to us. So those people who curse and insult them, in reality, are destroying Islam.

During a class of Imaam Maalik, it was mentioned that the Raafidite Shi'ites curse the Sahaabah. In reply, he quoted the Quranic verse, "**Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah and those with him are harsh with the disbelievers and gentle among themselves. So that the disbelievers may become enraged with them.**" He then said, "**Whoever becomes enraged when the Sahaabah are mentioned is one about whom the verse speaks.**" So, anyone who is enraged by the mention of the Sahaabah is a dsbeliever, because the verse says, "...the

disbelievers may become enraged with them (Sahaabah)."

Shia curses the Rightly Guided Khalifas (May Allah be pleased with them)

If they had any sense, they would know and appreciate that they are in reality cursing the Holy Prophet ﷺ himself. Abu Bakr and Umar were both fathers-in-law of the Prophet. Also, during the lifetime of the Prophet both were his right hand men; and after his demise, it is they who had great worry feeling for the welfare of Islam. Who else has ever been honored with such a position and honor as was granted to these two? Again, it is these two who had always participated and had been with the Prophet during all the battles. These facts are enough to refute the Shia beliefs.

As for Uthmaan, he was the husband to two daughters of the Prophet. It is clear that Allah does not choose for His Messenger a son-in-law and companions except those who are the best.

If the Rafida (Shia) are true to their claims, then could they explain why The Messenger ﷺ did not forewarn the Ummah and clarify the alleged enmity of the Rightly Guided Khalifas (i.e. Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthmaan) towards Islam?

Allah bears witness in the Qur'an that Abu Bakr is a close companion to the prophet Muhammad ﷺ by his saying:

"If ye help not (Muhammad ﷺ), (it is no matter): for Allah did indeed help him, when the Unbelievers drove him out: he had no more than one companion (Abu Bakr): they two were in the Cave, and he said to his companion, Have no fear for Allah is with us." (9:40)

Shia curses Ali (May Allah be pleased with him)

Their insults and curses are not limited just to the Rightly Guided Khalifas but are also directed towards Ali. Because Ali himself, in Masjid Rabia, gave the oath of allegiance (bai'ah) to Abu Bakr and also gave his daughter, Umm Kulthum in marriage to Umar. He also willingly gave the oath of allegiance (bai'ah) to Uthmaan. Not only this, but he was actually the right hand man and a well wisher of the Rightly Guided Khalifas. So could Ali chosen a kafir as a son-in-law for himself? And could Ali have given the oath of allegiance (bai'ah), as he did, to a kafir? Subhân Allah (Glory to God)! This indeed is a great accusation!

Shia curses Hasan son of Ali (May Allah be pleased with them)

Also, by cursing Mu'aawiya (May Allah be pleased with him), these Rafida (Shia) are actually cursing Hasan (May Allah be pleased with him). Because Hasan withdrew from, and gave up the Khilaafah to Mu'aawiya purely for the pleasure of Allah. The Messenger ﷺ foretold of this in the hadith. So can the grandson of The Messenger ﷺ actually have withdrawn from and left the Khilaafah in the hands of a Kafir for him to rule over the people? Subhân Allah! This indeed is a great accusation and insult!

If the Rafida say that Ali and Hasan were forced into doing this, then this is proof enough that these Rafida have no sense whatsoever. The accusations levelled against these two honored companions of the Prophet ﷺ are the worst insults ever imaginable and are beyond belief. They should remember that Ali faced the unbelievers in Mecca pace to face although Muslims were less than 40 man. So, why does he hide his Islam when Muslims became the majority and why he does not face the hypocrites?

Shia curses Aisha, the mother of the Believers (May Allah be pleased with her)

Furthermore, how do these Rafida curse and insult Umm ul Mu'mineen (mother of the Believers) A'isha when Allah Himself has mentioned her in the Qur'an as the mother of the believers?

"The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their (believers) mothers (as regards respect and marriage)." (Al-Ahzaab, verse 6)

There is no doubt whatsoever that only that person will curse and insult Umm al-Mu'mineen who does not consider her to be a mother. Because for one who does have a mother, does not curse and insult her, but loves her.

Allah promised to give a great punishment to those who slander her:

"When you were propagating it (the slander) with your tongues, and uttering with your mouths that whereof you had no knowledge, you counted it a little thing, while with Allah it was very great." (An-Nur 24:15)

Imam Malik stated that anyone who slanders her should be killed right away because Allah forbids us (in the Qur'an) from it forever and because anyone who curses the Prophet (p) or any member of this family should be killed too. This fatwa was also issued by his teacher Imam Ja'far al-Saadiq. Allah says:

"Allah forbids you from it (slandering 'A'isha) and warns you not to repeat the like of it forever, if you are believers." (An-Nur 24:17)

Ali vs. Jesus

Indeed, Christians and Shia are very similar as a way of thinking. For instance, Christians take their priests as gods other than Allah. Shia also take their Imams as gods other than Allah.

Christians take Jesus as a son of Allah then they describe his death on the cross as he is a weak man who can't do anything to support his faith. They made him a target to every kind of accusations, mocks, and humiliations. Shia on the other side give Ali a higher position than the prophet Muhammad (p) and claim that Islam wouldn't spread and unbelieving wouldn't be defeated without Ali. However, the claim that he too weak to defense Islam after the death of the prophet Muhammad (p) and he had to accept all kinds of accusations and humiliations against himself and against Ahlu-Bayt with no attempt to stop that.

Shia vs. Ahlu-Bayt

All members of Ahl-ul-Bayt (the family of the Holy Prophet) belong to Sunni Muslims. Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq for instance, is the teacher of Imam Malik and Imam Abu-Hanifa. None of Ahlu-Bayt subscribed to the false beliefs of these Rafida (Shia). There are numerous solid arguments based on logic and Shari'ah refuting their religion and false beliefs. These arguments are so many that it would be difficult to recount them all. Therefore they should repent from their false and unfounded beliefs and enter into the fold of Islam.

"They are the enemies, so beware of them. May Allah curse them! How are they denying (or deviating from) the Right Path." (al-Munaafiqoon, verse 4)

These Rafida (Shia) actually descend from [Abu Lu'luah Majoosi](#) (a Persian fire worshipper) and Abdullaah ibn Saba' (a Jew). However they are more dangerous from the Christians themselves. Christians fight Islam face to face (if they did) while Rafida stab Islam from its back.

Defense Of Abu Hurayrah

A Reply To Some Erroneous Claims

The Shia **claims** that:

Muslim in his Saheeh in Volume 1, writes that during the time of the Prophet ﷺ Umar bin Khattaab beat Aboo Hurayrah for fabricating lies.

In Volume 2 of Saheeh Muslim, he quotes 'Aa'ishah as, " Aboo Hurayrah is a great liar who fabricates ahaadeeth and attributes them to the holy Prophet ﷺ"

In Volume 4 of Saheeh Muslim, Nadwee says "Imaam Aboo Haneefah said, 'The Companions of the Prophet ﷺ were generally pious and just. I accept every haeeth narrated by them, but I do not accept the ahadeeth whose source is Aboo Hurayrah, Anas ibn Maalik, or Samrah ibn Jundab.'"

I have the following comments:

(1) It is obvious from the initial post that the information quoted is a poor rephrasing of some well known incidents surrounding Aboo Hurayrah's life - radiyallahu 'anhu - which have been addressed by the scholars. These events are often used to discount Aboo Hurayrah's veracity and thereby negate a large section of the Sunnah.

The two prominent sources in contemporary times for raising these allegations against Aboo Hurayrah are the Shee'ah and the students of the orientalists.

As for the former, many of these allegations are to be found in the work, Aboo Hurayrah, by the Lebanese Shee'ee author, Abd al-Husayn Sharaf ul-Deen al-'Amalee.

Aspects of this work were refuted by Dr. Muhammad Ajaaj al-Khateeb (Professor at the University of Damascus, Colleges of Sharia and Education) in his Master's thesis, al-Sunna Qabl al-Tadween (Cairo: 1483/1963) and also in his work, Aboo Hurayrah Raawiya al-Islaam (Cairo: 1962).

Regarding the latter, most of the arguments of the Orientalists were summarized by Mahmud Abu Rayyah of Egypt. In his work, Adwa' 'alas-Sunnat-il-Muhammadeeyah (Cairo: 1377/1958), Abu Rayya attempted to show that the Sunnah is fabricated in the whole and toward that aim he raised questions on Aboo Hurayrah's veracity.

When Abu Raya's book first appeared, a number of scholars addressed his arguments. The most prominent responses were

- 1 Dr. Mustafaa as-Sibaa'ee (founder of the Muslim Brotherhood in Syria), in his thesis, al-Sunna wa Makanatuha fit-Tashree' al-Islaamee, (Cairo: 1380/1961);
- 1 Shaykh 'Abdur-Razzaq Hamza (the head of Darul-Hadeeth in Makkah and Imaam of Masjid al-Haram), Zulumat Abi Raya amam Adwa' al-Sunnah al-Muhammadeeyah, (Cairo: n.d.); and
- 1 The definitive response by Shaykh 'Abdur-Rahmaan ibn Yahyaa al-Mu'allamee al-Yamanee (the Librarian of Masjid al-Haram), al-Anwaar ul-Kaashifah lima fee Kitaab Adwaa' 'ala al-Sunnah min al-Zallal wa l-Tadleel wa l-Mujaazafah, (Cairo: 1378) - may Allah have mercy with them all.

(2) It should be noted that pertaining to most of the objections raised against Aboo Hurayrah, there exists a definitive defense written by the Iraqi Muslim Brotherhood scholar, 'Abdul-Mun'im Saalih al-'Alee al-'Izzee, entitled *Dif'a 'an Abee Hurayrah* (Baghdad: 1393/1973). In this work, al-'Izzi reviewed, page by page, over 110 classical works (most of which are in a number of volumes, extending thousands of pages) with the aim of collecting everything related to Aboo Hurayrah.

With regards to the three specific objections raised against Aboo Hurayrah in the post, the response is as follows:

(3) 'Umar never beaten Aboo Hurayrah during the lifetime of the Prophet - ﷺ - for lying against the Prophet.

However, both 'Abdul-Husayn al-'Amalee (p. 268) and Abu Rayya (pp. 163, 171) report that 'Umar struck Aboo Hurayrah with a shield for relating too many hadeeth upon the Prophet - sallallahu 'alaihi wa sallam - and accused him of lying. The source of this incident is not Saheeh Muslim, **but rather a Shee'ee text**, *Sharh Nahj al-Balagha*, by the Shiite Mu'tazilite Ibn Abi al-Hadid who quotes Abu Ja'far al-Iskafi. Abu Ja'far al-Iskafi is a third century, Shiite Mu'tazalite. Al-Iskafi relates this incident with no chain or authorities (sanad). And thus this is an unverified historical incident that appears centuries after the deaths of 'Umar and Aboo Hurayrah. And moreover it is found in the works of those who harbor religious animosities against Aboo Hurayrah and adverse theological positions toward the Sunna. (See: al-Mu'allamee, al-Anwaer al-Kaashifah, pp. 152-153, al-Khateeb, al-Sunnah Qabl al-Tadween, p. 457, al-'Izzee, *Difaa' 'an Abee Hurayrah*, p. 123)

Historically, the Jahmee, Bishr al-Mareesee was perhaps the first to claim that 'Umar said that "the greatest liar among the narrators of hadeeth is Aboo Hurayrah." To this fabrication, Imam al-Darimee responded, "**How could 'Umar accuse him of lying against the Messenger of Allah - ﷺ - and [at the same time] place his in charge of important posts. Had [Aboo Hurayrah] been thought of by 'Umar - radiyallahu 'anhu - as [al-Mareesee] claimed, 'Umar would not have entrusted [Aboo Hurayrah] with the affairs of the Muslims, placing him in charge, time and time again.**"

Also, ad-Darimee rhetorically asks al-Mareesee, "**If you were truthful in your claim, then expose [to us] who narrated such. You will not be able to expose a trustworthy narrator.**" (See al-Darimi, *Radd al-Imaam al-Darimee 'Uthmaan ibn Sa'eed 'alaa Bishr al-Mareesee al-'Aneed*, pp. 132-135.)

Interestingly, al-'Izzee shows that a number of **grandsons of 'Umar** related hadeeth from Aboo Hurayrah from the Prophet - ﷺ. Among whom: (a) Salim ibn 'Abd Allah ibn 'Umar, who in Saheeh al-Bukhaaree alone relates three hadeeth; (b) and Hafs ibn 'Asim ibn 'Umar, who in Saheeh al-Bukhaaree alone relates eleven hadeeth. al-'Izzi comments (p. 123), "Did they not hear from their fathers that their grandfather considered Aboo Hurayrah a liar?"

(4) 'Aa'ishah - radiyallahu 'anha- never accused Aboo Hurayrah of lying. However, there do exist a number of incidents where she corrected Aboo Hurayrah for erring in the hadeeth he transmitted. This was not unique for Aboo Hurayrah, but rather 'Aa'ishah corrected a number of the Companions. Imaam al-Zarkashee (794 A.H.) has gathered and commented upon all the statements wherein which 'Aa'ishah corrected another of the Prophet's companions in his *al-Ijaba li Irad ma Istadraakahu 'Aa'ishah 'ala -Sahaabah*.

Of these criticisms by 'Aa'ishah, there exists one in Saheeh Muslim (Cairo: Vol. 3, p. 137). Specifically that Aboo Hurayrah related that the individual who at dawn (fajr) is in a state of sexual defilement, he is not permitted fast. When 'Aa'ishah and Umm Salamah were questioned regarding this they informed that the Prophet - ﷺ - during the month of Ramadan would awake at dawn in a state of sexual defilement not due to a dream (i.e., due to having sexual relations) and fast. When Aboo Hurayrah was later questioned as to his source, he informed that he heard that from al-Fadl ibn 'Abbas and not the Prophet - sallallahu 'alayhi wa sallam - directly.

Az-Zarkashee (Cairo: p. 57) informs that the ruling delivered by Aboo Hurayrah was initially the

ruling given by the Prophet -ﷺ- but was later abrogated. This abrogation it seems did not reach Aboo Hurayrah. That the ruling was abrogated is echoed in the verses regarding the permissibility of sexual relations with one's women during the night of Ramadan.

Moreover, it should be noted that a number of the leading scholars among the second generation (taabi'een), held the same opinion of Aboo Hurayrah. Among them was 'Aa'ishah's nephew, 'Urwah ibn al-Zubayr. It seems that 'Urwah interpreted 'Aa'ishah's statement to indicate a ruling specific to the Prophet -ﷺ- and not general for the umma. This opinion was also held by Taawoos, 'Ataa', Saalim ibn 'Abd Allah ibn 'Umar, al-Hasan al-Basree, and Ibraaheem al-Nakha'ee. And thus we see this opinion among the scholars of the tabi'in in the cities of Makkah, al-Madeenah, al-Basra, and al-Koofah.

Moreover, there are incidents which show that 'Aa'ishah did not consider Aboo Hurayrah to be a liar even if she corrected him at times. Among which is that 'Aa'ishah confirmed a hadeeth related by Aboo Hurayrah regarding the reward for following a funeral bier which was questioned by Ibn 'Umar. This is reported by al-Bukhaaree and Muslim. (See al-'Izzee, pp. 234-235)

Al-'Izzee (p. 110) also shows that when 'Aa'ishah and Hafsaah died Aboo Hurayrah led the funeral prayers and Ibn 'Umar was among the attendees. This is reported by al-Bukhaaree in his Taareekh as-Saghaar, p. 52. Al-Haakim reports in al-Mustadrak (Vol. 4, p. 6), that Ibn 'Umar was among the people and had no objections.

Al-'Izzee remarks, "**We know that the Muslims choose the best among them to lead funeral prayers, how much more so when it is the wife of their Prophet -ﷺ- in this world and the next?**"

One may surmise that had 'Umar considered Aboo Hurayrah to be a liar and beat him for that, how would Ibn 'Umar allow (indeed, have no objections) Aboo Hurayrah to lead the funeral prayer for his sister and Prophet's wife, Hafsaah? If 'Aa'ishah considered Aboo Hurayrah to be a liar, would the Muslims permit Aboo Hurayrah to lead the funeral prayers over her?

(5) As for Abu Haneefah's rejecting the narrations of these three companions.

However, what does exist is a principle of Usool al-Fiqh among the Hanafee scholars that those narrations of Aboo Hurayrah which are in agreement with analogy (al-qiyaas) are adopted, and what is in disagreement with analogy, one sees if the hadeeth has been accepted by the ummah, only then it is adopted; otherwise analogy is adopted in preference to hadeeth. (See Usool al-Sarkhasee, Vol. 1, p. 341)

The source of this principle is the Kufan scholar of the tabi'een, Ibraaheem an-Nakha'ee, who would not adopt all the hadeeth of Aboo Hurayrah. Al-Dhahabi in his Mizaan al-I'tidaal (Vol. 1, p. 35) reports that an-Nakha'ee explained his motivations by arguing that Aboo Hurayrah was not a scholar of fiqh (faqeeh).

In response, it should be noted: (a.) a number of scholars have objected to al-Nakha'i's position. Among whom ath-Thahabi, Ibn Katheer and Ibn 'Asaakir. (See ath-thahabi, Siyaar A'laam al-Nubalaa', Vol. 2, p. 438 and Ibn Katheer, al-Bidaayah wan-Nihaayah, Vol. 8, pp. 109-110); (b.) Ibn 'Abbas who is recognized as a faqeeh, once in a gathering says to Aboo Hurayrah, "Give a fatwa O Aboo Hurayrah;" (c.) For 23 years, after the death of 'Uthmaan - radiyallahu 'anhu - Aboo Hurayrah would deliver fatawa in al-Madeenah. (See Tabaqaat Ibn Sa'd, Vol. 2, p. 372). There are no objections by anyone to Aboo Hurayrah's knowledge of fiqh. Moreover, most of Aboo Hurayrah's students among the tabi'in were accomplished scholars and judges. (d.) In comparing, the instances where an-Nakha'ee did not adopt the narration of Aboo Hurayrah, we find that Aboo Hurayrah's narration is stronger than the opinion forwarded by an-Nakha'ee. (see al-'Izzee, pp. 237-248)

I hope this response will be satisfying. Again al-'Izzee's defense is the definitive work and it is in 500 pages.

One final note, al-'Izzi also goes under the pen name Ahmad al-Rashid. You might remember a couple of years ago he was arrested in the UAE (his place of residence) after returning from the MAYA conference. Just recently, he was released.

by Ali al-Timimi

Replying Against Shia From Their Most Authentic Book, Nahjul Balagha

The Shia turned Imam Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) down and did not support him in many battles even after they gave him their pledge and took an oath to obey him. Whenever he asked them for help, they opposed his commandments till he said to them:

"Now then, surely **jihad** is one of the doors of Paradise, which Allah has opened for His chief friends. It is the dress of piety and the protective armour of Allah and His trustworthy shield. Whoever abandons it Allah covers him with the dress of disgrace and the clothes of distress. He is kicked with contempt and scorn, and his heart is veiled with screens (of neglect). Truth is taken away from him because of missing **jihad**. He has to suffer ignominy and justice is denied to him."

"Beware! I called you (insistently) to fight these people night and day, secretly and openly and exhorted you to attack them before they attacked you, because by Allah, no people have been attacked in the hearts of their houses but they suffered disgrace; but you put it off to others and forsook it till destruction befell you and your cities were occupied."

"How strange! How strange! By Allah my heart sinks to see the unity of these people on their wrong and your dispersion from your right. Woe and grief befall you. You have become the target at which arrows are shot. You are being killed and you do not kill. You are being attacked but you do not attack. Allah is being disobeyed and you remain agreeable to it. When I ask you to move against them in summer you say it is hot weather. Spare us till heat subsides from us. When I order you to march in winter you say it is severely cold; give us time till cold clears from us. These are just excuses for evading heat and cold because if you run away from heat and cold, you would be, by Allah, running away (in a greater degree) from sword (war)."

"O' you semblance of men, not men (!!!), your intelligence is that of children and your wit is that of the occupants of the curtained canopies (women kept in seclusion from the outside world). I wish I had not seen you nor known you. By Allah, this acquaintance has brought about shame and resulted in repentance. May Allah fight you! You have filled my heart with pus and loaded my bosom with rage. You made me drink mouthful of grief one after the other. You shattered my counsel by disobeying and leaving me so much so that Quraysh started saying that the son of Abi Talib is brave but does not know (tactics of) war. Allah bless them ! Is any one of them more fierce in war and more older in it than I am? I rose for it although yet within twenties, and here I am, have crossed over sixty, but one who is not obeyed can have no opinion."

I [27. Indeed, jihad is one of the doors of Paradise ...](#)

Then he described their jihad by saying:

"O' people, your bodies are together but your desires are divergent. Your talk softens the hard stones and your action attracts your enemy towards you. You claim in your sittings that you would do this and that, but when fighting approaches, you say (to war), "turn thou away" (i.e. flee away). If one calls you (for help) the call receives no heed. And he who deals hardly with you his heart has no solace. The excuses are amiss like that of a debtor unwilling to pay. The ignoble can not ward off oppression. Right cannot be achieved without effort. Which is the house besides this one to protect? And with which leader (Imam) would you go for fighting after me?"

"By Allah! deceived is one whom you have deceived while, by Allah! he who is successful with you receives only useless arrows. You are like broken arrows thrown over the enemy. By Allah! I am now in the position that I neither confirm your views nor hope for your support, nor challenge the enemy through you. What is the matter with you? What is your ailment? What is your cure? The other party is also men of your shape (but they are so different in character). Will there be talk

without action, carelessness without piety and greed in things not right?!"

- | [29. O people, who are together with their bodies, but ...](#)

Then he said to them:

"Woe to you. I am tired of rebuking you. Do you accept this worldly life in place of the next life? Or disgrace in place of dignity? When I invite you to fight your enemy your eyes revolve as though you are in the clutches of death, and in the senselessness of last moments. My pleadings are not understood by you and you remain stunned. It is as though your hearts are affected with madness so that you do not understand. You have lost my confidence for good. Neither are you a support for me to lean upon, nor a means to honour and victory. Your example is that of the camels whose protector has disappeared, so that if they are collected from one side they disperse away from the other side."

- | [34. Woe to you! I am tired of rebuking you ...](#)

And after Ali scolds his Shia, he brings up an example so they use it as a role model. He did not find any examples but those of the Sahaba (who are apostates in the opinion of Shia)

"I have seen the companions of the Prophet but I do not find anyone resembling them (!!!). They began the day with dust on the hair and face (in hardship of life) and passed the night in prostration and standing in prayers. Sometimes they put down their foreheads and sometimes their cheeks. With the recollection of their resurrection it seemed as though they stood on live coal. It seemed that in between their eyes there were signs like knees of goats, resulting from long prostrations. When Allah was mentioned their eyes flowed freely till their shirt collars were drenched. They trembled for fear of punishment and hope of reward as the tree trembles on the day of stormy wind." (Those are the one's whom Kalini claims are Kuffar in Al-Kafi, the most authentic Shia books!)

- | [96. If He gives respite to the oppressor ...](#)

Then he describes his fighting with the Sahaba by saying:

"In the company of the Prophet of Allah (PBUH) we used to fight our parents, sons, brothers and uncles, and this continued us in our faith, in submission, in our following the right path, in endurance over the pangs of pain and in our fight against the enemy. A man from our side and one from the enemy would pounce upon each other like energetic men contesting as to who would kill the other; sometime our man got over his adversary and some-time the enemy's man got over ours."

"When Allah had observed our truth He sent ignominy to our foe and sent His succour to us till Islam got established (like the camel) with neck on the ground and resting in its place. By my life, if we had also behaved like you (he is talking to his Shi'a), no pillar of (our) religion could have been raised, nor the tree of faith could have borne leaves (!!!!). By Allah, certainly you will now milk our blood (instead of milk) and eventually you will face shame."

- | [55. In the company of the Prophet ﷺ](#)

"By Allah, he whom people like you support must suffer disgrace and he who throws arrows with your support is as if he throws arrows that are broken both at head and tail. By Allah, within the courtyard you are quite numerous but under the banner you are only a few... Allah may disgrace your faces and destroy you. **You do not understand the right as you understand the wrong and do not crush the wrong as you crush the right.**"

- | [68. How long shall I accord to you the consideration ...](#)

And he said, exposing their hypocrisy:

"By Allah, **I did not come to you of my own accord**. I came to you by force of circumstances (!!!). I have come to know that you say `Ali speaks lie!!! May Allah fight you! Against whom do I speak lie? Whether against Allah? But I am the first to have believed in him. Whether against His Prophet? But I am the first who testified to him. Certainly not. By Allah it was a way of expression which you failed to appreciate, and you were not capable of it."

┆ [70. O people of Iraq ...](#)

When people decided to Swear allegiance at Amir al-mu'minin's hand after the murder of `Uthman, he said:

"**Leave me and seek some one else**. We are facing a matter which has (several) faces and colours, which neither hearts can stand nor intelligence can accept. Clouds are hovering over the sky, and faces are not discernible. You should know that if I respond to you I would lead you as I know and would not care about whatever one may say or abuse. **If you leave me then I am the same as you are**. It is possible I would listen to and obey **whomever** you make in charge of your affairs. **I am better for you as a counsellor than as chief**."

┆ [91. Leave me and find someone else ...](#)

Ali (RA) said to the Kharijites:

"With regard to me, two categories of people will be ruined, namely he who loves me too much and the love takes him away from rightfulness, and he who hates me too much and the hatred takes him away from rightfulness. The best man with regard to me is he who is on the **middle course**. So be with him and **be with the great majority** (of Muslims) because Allah's hand (of protection) is on keeping unity. You should beware of division because the one isolated from the group is (a prey) to Satan just as the one isolated from the flock of sheep is (a prey) to the wolf."

And we all know that people at that time were divided into three groups:

1. Ahlu-Sunnah wal Jama'a (Sunnis): Those were the majority who loved Imam Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) on the middle course.
2. The Shia: The ones who loved him too much till they were deviated from the Straight Path.
3. The Khawarij: Those who hated him till they were deviated from the Straight Path.

So Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) proved the perishability of the Shia and Kharijites and called for joining Ahlu-Sunnah. What other speech will they ever believe????!!

┆ [126. If you refuse to stop claiming ...](#) (127)

"I praise Allah for whatever matter He ordained and whatever action He destines and for my trial with you, O' group of people who do not obey when I order and do not respond when I call you. If you are at ease you engage in (conceited) conversation, but if you are faced with battle you show weakness. If people agree on one Imam you taunt each other. If you are faced with an arduous matter you turn away from it. May others have no father (woe to your enemy!) what are you waiting for in the matter of your assistance and for fighting for your rights? For you there is either death or disgrace. By Allah, if my day (of death) comes. and it is sure to come, it will cause separation between me and you although I am sick of your company and feel lonely with you. May Allah deal with you! Is there no religion which may unite you nor sense of shamefulness that may sharpen you?"

1 [179. I praise God for what He has ordained ...](#)

"By Allah, **I had no liking for the caliphate nor any interest in government**, but you yourselves invited me to it and prepared me for it."

1 [204. Addressed to Talhah and al-Zubayr ...](#)

"May Allah reward such and such man (*) who straightened the curve, cured the disease, abandoned mischief and established the **sunnah**. He departed (from this world) with untarnished clothes and little shortcomings. He achieved good (of this world) and remained safe from its evils. He offered Allah's obedience and feared Him as He deserved. He went away and left the people in dividing ways wherein the misled cannot obtain guidance and the guided cannot attain certainty."

(*) Ibn Abi'l-Hadid has written (in [Sharh Nahj al-balaghah](#), vol. 14, pp. 3-4) that the reference here is to the second Caliph `Umar, and that these sentences have been uttered in his praise as indicated by the word 'Umar' written under the word 'such and such' in as-Sayyid ar-Radi's own hand in the manuscript of [Nahj al-balaghah](#) written by him.

1 [226. So and so did good for God's sake ...](#)

"Verily, those who took the oath of allegiance to Abu Bakr, Umar and Uthman have sworn allegiance to me. Now those who were present at the election have no right to go back against their oaths of allegiance and those who were not present on the occasion have no right to oppose me. And so far as Shura (limited franchise or selection) was concerned it was supposed to be limited to Muhajirs and Ansars and it was also supposed that whomsoever they selected, became caliph as per approval and pleasure of Allah. If somebody goes against such decision, then he should be persuaded to adopt the course followed by others, and if he refuses to fall in line with others, then war is the only course left open to be adopted against him and as he has refused to follow the course followed by the Muslims, Allah will let him wander in the wilderness of his ignorance and schism."

1 [To Mu'awiya on his \(Ali's\) right to the caliphate.](#)

"The thing began in this way: We and the Syrians were facing each other while we had common faith in one Allah, in the same Prophet ﷺ and on the same principles and canons of religion. So far as faith in Allah and the Holy Prophet ﷺ was concerned we never wanted them (the Syrians) to believe in anything over and above or other than what they were believing in and they did not want us to change our faith. Both of us were united on these principles. The point of contention between us was the question of the murder of Uthman. It had created the split. They wanted to lay the murder at my door while I am actually innocent of it."

1 [To the people of various provinces, giving them the causes of the Battle of Siffin.](#)

Those are the Shia of Ali and his children and those are the companions of the Prophet (PBUH) in the opinion of Ali and from their most authentic books. But Shia refuse to admit the truth though it's apparent to all. So I can't describe them with anything other than what Ali (RA) did when he said: You do not understand the right as you understand the wrong and do not crush the wrong as you crush the right.

The Myth Of The Shia Mahdi

The 15th of Sha'baan is a very significant date, both to the Ahl as-Sunnah and the Shi'ah. The Shi'ah, however, have their own reason for ascribing significance to this night. To them it is the night of the birth of their twelfth Imam, the Hidden Mahdi.

Who is this Mahdi whose return to this world is so eagerly awaited by the Shi'ah, and belief in whose existence in occultation forms such an integral aspect of the Shi'i psyche? Before an adequate answer to this question may be given, there is a need to understand certain aspects concerning the Shi'i doctrine of Imamah.

Background

The cornerstone of the Shi'i faith is the belief that the spiritual and temporal leadership of this Ummah after the demise of Rasulallah ﷺ is vested in the Imam, who is appointed, like the Nabi ﷺ himself, by Allah, and who enjoys all the distinctions and privileges of the Nabi ﷺ.

However, they believe that Imamah, unlike Nubuwwah, can never come to an end. In this regard there is a well-known Shi'i hadith which says that "the world cannot exist without an Imam", and another which goes that "if the earth were to be without an Imam for a single day it would sink."

Thus, when it came to pass that the first of those whom they regard as their Imams — Sayyiduna Ali radiyallahu 'anhu — left this world, a problem arose. Some of those who regarded themselves as his followers claimed that he did not in fact die, but that he will return to establish justice. Others said that he was succeeded as Imam by his son Hasan, who was in turn succeeded by his brother Husayn.

When Husayn died there were some who claimed to follow their other brother Muhammad (known as Ibn al-Hanafiyyah) as their Imam. When he died his followers claimed that he was in reality alive, and that he will return in due time. Others amongst the Shi'ah took Sayyiduna Husayn's son, Ali, surnamed Zayn al-'Abidin, as their Imam, and upon his death transferred their loyalties to his son, Muhammad al-Baqir.

When al-Baqir died there were once again elements from amongst the Shi'ah who denied his death and claimed that he would return one day, while others took his son Ja'far as-Sadiq as their Imam.

When he died there was mass confusion amongst the Shi'ah: each of his sons Isma'il, Abdullah, Muhammad, Zakariyya, Ishaq and Musa was claimed by various groups amongst the Shi'ah to be their Imam. In addition to them there was a group who believed that Ja'far did not really die, and that he would return one day.

More or less the same thing happened at the death of his son Musa. Some of the Shi'ah denied his death, believing that he will return, and others decided to take as their new Imam one of his sons. Some of these chose his son Ahmad, while others chose his other son Ali ar-Rida.

After him they took as their Imam his son Muhammad al-Jawwad (or at-Taqi), and after him his son Ali al-Hadi (or an-Naqi). At the death of Ali al-Hadi they looked upon his son Hasan al-Askari as their new — and 11th — Imam.

The Death Of Hasan Al-Askari

The above is a very brief synopsis of a tumultuous and confusing history — a history from which a

dedicated researcher might extract some very revealing facts about the development of Shi'ism.

However, that is not our concern at this moment. We have now arrived at the year 254 AH, the time when a major section of the Shi'ah accepted as their Imam the 22-year old Hasan, son of Ali al-Hadi, and 10th lineal descendant of Sayyiduna Ali and Sayyidah Fatimah *radiyallahu 'anhuma*. Six years later, in 260 AH, Hasan al-Askari, at the very young age of 28, is lying on his deathbed, but unlike any of his forefathers *he leaves no offspring*, no one to whom the Shi'ah might appropriate as their new Imam.

The Shi'ah who had been regarding Hasan al-Askari as their Imam were thrown into mass disarray. Does this mean the end of the Imamah? The end of the Imamah would mean the end of Shi'ism. Were they prepared for that?

The confusion that reigned amongst the Shi'ah after the death of Hasan al-Askari is reflected by the Shi'i writer Hasan ibn Musa an-Nawbakhti, who counts the emergence of altogether 14 sects amongst the followers of Hasan al-Askari, each one with a different view on the future of the Imamah and the identity of the next Imam. It must be noted that an-Nawbakhti was alive at the time all of this was taking place. Another Shi'i writer, Sa'd ibn Abdullah al-Qummi, who also lived during the same time, counts 15 sects, and a century later the historian al-Mas'udi enumerates altogether 20 separate sects.

Trends

There were four major trends amongst these various sects:

- (1) There were those who accepted the death of Hasan al-Askari as a fact, and accepted also the fact that he left no offspring. To them Imamah had thus come to an end, just like Nubuwwah came to an end with the death of Rasulullah r . However, there were some amongst them who kept hoping for the advent of a new Imam.
- (2) The second trend was one to which the student of the history of "succession to the Imamah" would be much more used to. This was the tendency to deny the death of Hasan al-Askari, and to claim that he would return in the future to establish justice upon earth. We have seen this tendency emerge amongst the Shi'ah at more than one critical juncture in the history of the Imamah of the Shi'ah; it is therefore only logical to expect it to resurface at a moment as critical as the death of Hasan al-Askari.
- (3) The third trend was to extend the chain of Imamah to Hasan's brother Ja'far.
- (4) The fourth trend was the claim that Hasan al-Askari did in fact have a son. It is the fourth trend which ultimately became the view of the dominant group in Shi'ism.

The Missing Son

This trend was spearheaded by persons who had set themselves up as the representatives of the Imam, and who were in control of a network covering various parts of the Islamic empire— a network for the purpose of collecting money in the name of the Imams of the Ahl al-Bayt.

All followers of the Imams were obliged to pay one fifth of their income to the representatives of the Imams. (This is a practice which continues up to today.) At the head of this network was a man called Uthman ibn Sa'id al-'Amri. His manner of resolving the predicament was unique: Hasan al-Askari was dead, he admitted, but he was not childless. He had a 4-year old son, Muhammad, with whom no one but he— Uthman ibn Sa'id— could have contact. And from that point onwards he would act as the representative (*wakeel*) of the Hidden Imam and collect money in his name.

To the fact that Hasan al-Askari's own family were completely ignorant of the existence of any child of his, and that his estate had been divided between his brother Ja'far and his mother, Uthman ibn Sa'id and his ilk responded by denouncing Ja'far as [al-Kadhhab](#) (the Liar).

In due time a fantastic story was brought into circulation about the union between Hasan al-Askari and a Roman slave-girl, who is variously named as Narjis, Sawsan or Mulaykah. She is mentioned as having been the daughter of Yusha' (Joshua), the Roman emperor, who is a direct descendant of the apostle Simon Peter. But history shows that there never was a Roman emperor of that name. The Roman emperor of the time was Basil I, and neither he nor any other emperor is known to have descended from Peter. The story goes on to tell of her capture by the Muslim army, how she eventually came to be sold to Hasan al-Askari, and of her supernatural pregnancy and the secret birth of the son of whom no one—aside from Uthman ibn Sa'id and his clique—knew anything. Everything about the child is enveloped in a thick and impenetrable cloud of mystery.

The Four Representatives

Uthman ibn Sa'id remained the "representative of the Hidden Imam" for a number of years. In all that time he was the only link the Shi'ah had with their Imam. During that time he supplied the Shi'i community with [tawqi'at](#), or written communications, which he claimed was written to them by the Hidden Imam. Many of these communications, which are still preserved in books like at-Tusi's [Kitab al-Ghaybah](#), had to do with denouncing other claimants to the position of representatives, who had come to realise exactly how lucrative a position Uthman ibn Sa'id had created for himself. The Shi'i literature dealing with Uthman ibn Sa'id's tenure as representative is replete with references to money collected from the Shi'i public.

When Uthman ibn Sa'id died, his son Abu Ja'far Muhammad produced a written communication from the Hidden Imam in which he himself is appointed the second representative, a position which he held for about 50 years. He too, like his father, had to deal with several rival claimants to his position, but the [tawqi'at](#) which he regularly produced to denounce them and reinforce his own position ensured the removal of such obstacles and the continuation of support from a credulous Shi'i public.

He was followed in this position by Abul Qasim ibn Rawh an-Nawbakhti, a scion of the powerful and influential Nawbakhti family of Baghdad. Before succeeding Muhammad ibn Uthman, Abul Qasim an-Nawbakhti was his chief aide in the collection of the one-fifth taxes from the Shi'ah. Like his two predecessors, he too had to deal with rival claimants, one of whom, Muhammad ibn Ali ash-Shalmaghani used to be an accomplice of his. He is reported in Abu Ja'far at-Tusi's book [Kitab al-Ghaybah](#) as having stated: "We knew exactly what we were into with Abul Qasim ibn Rawh. We used to fight like dogs over this matter (of being representative)."

When Abul Qasim an-Nawbakhti died in 326 AH he bequeathed the position of representative to Abul Hasan as-Samarri. Where the first three representatives were shrewd manipulators, Abul Hasan as-Samarri proved to be a more conscientious person. During his three years as representative there was a sudden drop in [tawqi'at](#). Upon his deathbed he was asked who his successor would be, and answered that Allah would Himself fulfil the matter. Could this perhaps be seen as a refusal on his part to perpetuate a hoax that has gone on for too long? He also produced a [tawqi'](#) in which the Imam declares that from that day till the day of his reappearance he will never again be seen, and that anyone who claims to see him in that time is a liar.

Thus, after more or less 70 years, the last "door of contact" with the Hidden Imam closed. The Shi'ah term this period, in which there was contact with their Hidden Imam through his representatives-cum-tax-collectors, the Lesser Occultation ([al-Ghaybah as-Sughra](#)), and the period from the death of the last representative onwards the Greater Occultation ([al-Ghaybah al-Kubar](#)). The Greater Occultation has already continued for over a thousand years.

Activities Of The Representatives

When one reads the classical literature of the Shi'ah in which the activities of the four representatives are outlined, one is struck by the constantly recurring theme of money. They are almost always mentioned in connection with receiving and collecting "the Imam's money" his loyal Shi'i followers. There is a shocking lack of any activities of an academic or spiritual nature. Not a single one of the four is credited with having compiled any book, despite the fact that they were in exclusive communion with the last of the Imams, the sole repository of the legacy of Rasulullah [sallallahu 'alayhi wasallam](#).

When we look at the major sources upon which the Shi'i faith is based, we find that most of them were written after the onset of the Greater Occultation. Those works, like [al-Kafi](#), which was written during the latter decades of the Lesser Occultation, contain scarcely a reference to any of the four representatives as narrators from the Hidden Imam. Instead it is filled with thousands of reports which go back, via other channels, to the fifth and the sixth Imams. That is indeed strange, considering the fact that a man like Uthman ibn Sa'id al-'Amri is claimed to have been closely associated with the 10th, the 11th as well as the hidden 12th Imam, and also the fact that his son remained the Shi'i community's solitary link to that Imam for half a century. Would it not have been better and more authoritative for an author like al-Kulayni to report the hadith of his Imams from the Hidden Imam via his representatives who lived in Baghdad at the same time as he rather than to trace it all back to the fifth and sixth Imams through a myriad of doubtful channels?

But of course, he could not have done that, because the activities of those representatives did not have as much to do with authentically preserving the legacy of the Ahl al-Bayt as with the collection of wealth in their names.

In light of the fact that the Shi'ah explain the necessity of Imamah in terms of the need for an infallible guide who serves as the repository of the legacy of Ahl al-Bayt, it appears extremely incongruous that this particular guide has left no sort of legacy of his own whereby the legacy of the Ahl al-Bayt can be known. Despite the fact that an infallible guide supposedly exists, it is upon fallible persons such as Muhammad ibn Ya'qub al-Kulayni that the Shi'ah must depend for that legacy.

The only bit of information that has come down to us regarding the Hidden Imam's authentication of the hadith legacy of the Shi'ah is what is recorded by Aqa Muhammad Baqir Khwansari in his book [Rawdat al-Jannat](#). He writes that al-Kulayni's book was presented to the Hidden Imam who looked at it and declared, "[Hadha Kaafin li-Shi'atina](#)" (This is enough for our Shi'ah). This is incidentally how the book received its name.

A report such as this creates a huge problem. It appears to be a ratification of the contents of the book [al-Kafi](#) by the infallible Imam. Yet, 9 centuries later the Shi'i muhaddith, Mulla Muhammad Baqir Majlisi, would declare in his commentary on [al-Kafi](#), named [Mir'at al-Uqul](#), that 9,485 out of the 16,121 narrations in [al-Kafi](#) are unreliable. What did Majlisi know that the infallible Imam was so unaware of that he would authenticate a book, 60% of whose contents would later be discovered to be unreliable?

Evaluation

The Iraqi Shi'i scholar, Muhammad Baqir as-Sadr, finds proof for the existence of the Hidden Mahdi in what he calls "the experience of a community". The existence of the Hidden Imam, he postulates, was experienced by the Shi'i community as a whole in the written communications that the representatives used supplied them with.

The crux of this argument lies in the fact that an individual experience might be doubted, but never that of experience of an entire community. However, the glaring flaw in this line of reasoning is that it very conveniently overlooks the part of the representatives as the [individual](#) go-betweens.

The community never had the privilege of seeing or meeting the person they believed to be the author of the [tawqi'at](#). Their experience was limited to receiving what the representatives produced. Even the argument of a consistent handwriting in all the various [tawqi'at](#) is at best melancholy. There is no way one can get away from the fact that the existence of the Hidden Imam rests upon [nothing other than acceptance of the words of the representatives](#).

The activities of those representatives furthermore go a long way to show that they were much, much more inspired by the desire to possess than by pious sentiments of any kind.

So when the Shi'ah commemorate the birth of their twelfth Imam on the 15th night of Sha'ban, or when they seek to apply ahadith in Sunni sources which speak of twelve khalifas to their twelve Imams, then let us ask them on what basis do they accept the existence of the twelfth one?

History bears witness to the existence of eleven persons in that specific line of descent, but when we come to the twelfth one, all we have is claims made by persons whose activities in the name of their Hidden Imam give us all the reason in the world to suspect their honesty and integrity.

In Islam, issues of faith can never be based upon evidence of this kind.

The Shia Practice Of The Forbidden Temporary Marriage

All praise is due to Allah, Whom we ask for help and forgiveness. We seek the protection of Allah from the sins of ourselves and our deeds. No one can misguide whom He guides, and whom He does not guide, will never find a guide.

I testify that there is no God but Allah, the One with no partner, and that Muhammad (s.a.w) is His slave and Messenger.

In the days before the battle of khaibar the Prophet ﷺ permitted the use of temporary marriage.

"Narrated Salama bin Al-Akwa' (r.a): 'In the year of Autas, Allahs Messenger ﷺ permitted a temporary marriage for three nights, but he prohibited it afterwards." {Sahih Muslim}

Unfortunately the Shiah had conveniently forgotten the part where it was forbidden, and have fabricated many lies trying to justify this clear haram act.... Insha-Allah firstly I will quote just some of the hadeeth clearly stating that this form of marriage is haram.

- 1 "Narrated 'Ali (r.a): Allah's Messenger ﷺ forbade the temporary marriage in the year of khaibar." {Sahih Muslim & Sahih Bukhari}
- 1 "Narrated 'Ali (r.a): At the battle of Khaibar, the Prophet ﷺ forbade the temporary marriage (i.e Mu'ta) of women, and the eating of the flesh of domestic asses." {Sahih Bukhari, Sahih Muslim, Ahmad, An-Nasa'i, At-Termidhi and Ibn Majah have all collected it}
- 1 "Narrated Rabi bin Sabra on the Authority of his father: 'Allah's Messenger ﷺ said: "I had permitted you the temporary marriage of women, but Allah has prohibited you from that till the day of Resurrection. So if anyone has a woman by temporary marriage he should let her go; and do not take back any of your gifts from them." {Sahih Muslim , Abu Dawud, An-Nasai and Ibn Majah}

Anyone with the right mind can see that temporary marriage is clearly forbidden, but again the shia have rejected all Hadeeth in this matter and still continue to follow their desires, even if it is zina (fornication, adultery etc.).

Insha-Allah one can not compare the above hadeeth with some fabricated lies from the Shia:

Aytollah Khomaini stated in his book "Tahir-u-Wasila, Vol 2, P.292" that Temporary marriage can be for one day, a night, and even just a few hours! but for khomaini that was not enough so he further states in the same book on page 292, that temporary marriage can be performed with harlots and prostitutes.

Now I will quote a fabricated shia lie with was attributed to Muhammad ﷺ:

On page 356 in volume 1 of 'Tafseer Minhajul Sadiqeen' it is mentioned that Muhammad ﷺ said: "One who performs Mu'ta (temporary marriage) one will attain the rank of Imam Husain; one who performs it twice will attain the rank of Imam Hasan; one who

performs it thrice will attain the rank of Ameer al Mo'mineen (Ali r.a) and one who performs it four times will attain my rank."

Subhanallah!!! is this the lowest the Shia can get???? sleep with a prostitute and get instant Paradise????? However for the shia this can never be enough... they have still worse to come.

Infact the amount of Shia references would be enough to fill a book on this subject.. as the shia indeed try at every step to justify this forbidden act.

In the Shia Book "Minhaj us Sadiqeen" in volume 1, it is written in clear words that the number of women that a person can be engaged with in temporary marriage at the same time is unlimited....

May Allah guide and protect us from this and all the other Shia filth that they try to enforce upon us....

Any good out of this, is from Allah. And any error in this is from myself and Shaytan.

Temporary Marriage

A Plea From A Muslim Sister

I was fourteen years old and my relationship with my parents was on the edge just like any other teenager. I started to become interested in boys. I felt as if no one understood me, not even my friends. I especially didn't feel pretty with my braces

It all changed when I met him. It was fascinating to know that a college student would care so much about me. He was the most wonderful person. He treated me like a queen, and soon we became the best of friends. I felt I could tell him anything. As our friendship progressed, we talked about different topics including religion. He had different beliefs than me; he was Shia while I was Sunni. We always argued upon the differences. He had a way with making things sound better than what they were. Soon I became very confused.

One day he mentioned the idea of Mut'a. He told me that it was a type of temporary marriage, which was halal even in Sunni books. At first I didn't believe him, but he used sources such as Bukhari and Muslim. I took his word for it, and before I realized, I was into a lot of trouble. I was in Mut'a for four years. As time went by, I learnt that I had lost my honor and dignity to someone who had done this to several other girls. Allah helped me open my eyes and realize what I had gotten myself into. By now, I was on the verge of switching beliefs to be a Shia. At this point, I decided to really search for the truth. Since I cannot present the whole research, I have tried to give a very brief idea about Mut'a.

I hope to inform and educate the people about the disease of Mut'a, which is spreading rapidly in the sunni community. It is the goal of certain Shia individuals to do Mut'a with innocent girls, who lack knowledge of religion and experience of life. They convince them with their beliefs, and create confusion in their minds. I beg every sister, brother, father, mother, and friend to take a closer look at their dear ones, and make sure they do not become victims to the concept of Mut'a.

Mut'a is a form of temporary marriage where a man can marry a woman for an agreed amount of time and money (mahr). In Mut'a, the husband is not financially responsible for the wife. There are no set limits in this kind of marriage by the Shias. According to Shia beliefs, no witnesses nor a permission of the guardian is needed (the Sunni father does not believe in Mut'a), and there is no limit on the number of Mut'a one can do.

Also, the time period can be as little as one hour to as long as sixty years. In addition, a man who is permanently married can do as many Mut'a as he feels like, even with married women. This is very similar to prostitution indeed

In the history of Islam, The Prophet ﷺ allowed Mut'a twice in his lifetime. The first time the Prophet ﷺ allowed it for three days, at the war of Khaiber, and after three days it was made haram. Once Ali argued with a man who believed in Mut'a and told him that the Prophet made Mut'a and the meat of donkey haram on the day of Khaiber (Bukhari vol. 7, pg. 287 and vol. 4 pg. 134). This hadith can also be found in Shia hadith books, which I will mention later. The second time the Prophet ﷺ allowed it was at the conquest of Mecca, for three days, and then he made it haram again till the day of Judgment (Muslim vol. 4 pg. 133). Notice, the practice of Mut'a was then made haram till the Day of Judgement. This is confirmed with the hadiths in the following books: Imam Ahmed's Musnad vol. 16 pg. 192-193, Muslim vol. 4, pg. 132, Bayhaki vol. 7 pg. 293-294. Since there was a time when Mut'a was halal. Therefore, one can find hadith saying that it was halal. However, the latter hadith, which follows the final order of jurisprudence set by the the Prophet ﷺ, takes precedence over the former hadith.

Ninety-nine percent of the companions followed this opinion, but there was one percent who

believed Mut'a can be performed in extreme case of necessity in the land of war. This one percent is divided into two groups. One says, it is allowed with the Caliph's permission, and the other says there is no need for the permission. Those who do not believe in Caliph's permission say that it was Umar who made it haram. Their proof is based upon an opinion by a companion namely Ibn Abbas. People misused this opinion of Ibn Abbas until he clarified himself and said, Wallahi I did not mean what they did! I meant similarly to what Allah meant when he allowed the meat of dead animals and pork to be eaten in extreme necessity. This is referring to the time when people abused the rule of necessity at time of Umar, following the understanding of the one percent. Finally, Umar declared and taught it to be haram when a lady came to Umar complaining about how her husband in Mut'a, who was married, would not take responsibility of the child. He realized how the society was becoming corrupt with similar conditions to adultery. Thus, he had to teach people and make Mut'a haram even in the case of the one percent opinion

The Shia themselves have a hadith narrated by **Ali (r.a.a)** which states that the Prophet made Mut'a haram on the day of Khaiber (Book of Tahdeeb: vol. 7, pg. 251, rewaya 10). The author states that **Ali lied for the purposes of Taqiya**. In Book of Istebzar: vol. 3, pg. 142, rewaya 5, there is a declaration by **Ali that Mut'a is haram. Again they accuse Ali of lying for Taqiya**.

With the given confusion in the books of Shias regarding Mut'a, and it being haram among the sunnis, should really make one think hard before believing that they are doing marriage in a halal way and in the name of Allah.

If Mut'a is not an excuse for satisfying lust, then what is it! It seems to be the easiest solution for adultery. If Mut'a really was to be done in case of need then why is it permissible for a married person to do Mut'a? Also, if one cannot marry due to financial insecurity then how can one be responsible for supporting the child and not be able to support the wife? And how is he going to know if the child is actually his, not someone else's?

The Shia also use the Qur'an, Surah 4 ayah 24, as a reference to support Mut'a. They use this Ayah without consideration of the previous or following verses. The Ayah cannot be looked at alone. An example of this is Surah 107 verse 4 **"So woe to the worshipers,"** If we look at this Ayah alone we would think Allah is angered by the worshipers, but if we read on it says in verse 5 **"who are neglectful of their prayers."** This gives a better understanding of what Allah is telling us. If we read till the end, we will get a better understanding of what Allah is trying to say.

Now, the Shia look at only surah 4 Ayah 24. When Allah says **"Except for those all other are lawful, provided ye seek (them in marriage) with gifts from your property Desiring chastity, not lust,"** We take into consideration the Ayah before, that describes all the women forbidden for marriage. Surah 4 Ayah 23, **Prohibited to you (for marriage) are-your mothers, daughters, sisters; father s sisters, mother s sisters;"** Thus, when Allah says in Ayah 24 that all other are lawful we understand it as all other are lawful women.

The Ayah continues **"seeing that ye derive enjoyment from them give them their dower (at least)"** as prescribed The Shia say that Mut'a is the enjoyment-marriage that Allah is talking about, and that you pay for this enjoyment. To get a clear understanding of how we translate this Ayah we have to know this is a shariah hokoom (judgment) from Allah about the payment of the dower.

If a man marries a woman and then divorces her, there are four different scenarios that could happen concerning the dower. They are as follows:

- 1)A man does not enjoy his wife and he does not assign a dower.
- 2)A man does not enjoy his wife but he assigns a dower.
- 3)A man enjoys his wife but he doesn't assign a dower.

4)A man enjoys his wife but he doesn't pay the assigned dower.

The first hokoom is in surah 2 verse 236, **"There is no blame on you if ye divorce a women before consummation or the fixation of their dower: but bestow on them (a suitable gift)."** There is also a hadith that the Prophet divorced a women before he touched her or assigned a dowery. He gave her some gifts (2 pairs of clothing), and then he released her.

The second hokoom is in surah 2 verse 237, **"And if ye divorce them before consummation but after the fixation of a dower for them, then the half of the dower (is due to them)."** The third hokoom is in surah 4 verse 4 And give their dower as an obligation;.. In Arabic, this word that has been translated into obligation can be more closely translated into standard obligation . So the man should pay to her what the Muslim society has made into a standard.

The last hokoom is if you assigned maher and enjoyed your wife you should pay it since you enjoyed her whether there is a divorce or not.

This hokoom is in surah 4 Ayah 24, **"seeing that ye derive enjoyment from them give them their dower (at least) as prescribed; but if after a dower is prescribed, ye agree mutually (to vary it), there is no blame on you, and Allah is All-Knowing, All-Wise."** For the Shia, it is a law that you pay the dower before the enjoyment or else there cannot be a Mut'a. This Ayah is talking about coming to an agreement and discussing the payment of the dower even after the whole thing is over or paying it after the enjoyment. So we can see that Mut'a does not fit.

There are also other differences. If you keep reading to Ayah 5 it says, **"If any of you have not the means wherewith to wed free believing women, they may wed believing girls from among those whom your right hand possess and Allah hath full knowledge about your faith. Ye are one from another: wed them with the leave of their owners and give them their dowers, according to what is reasonable: they should be chaste not lustful..** This Ayah says that permission is needed from the guardian, and the Ayah continues teaching us about the differences in the law of the free believer and the right hand possess. In the end of the verse, it says that even to marry what the right hand possess is a big dislike to Allah that a person should not do unless he is really in danger of committing a big sin. Then Allah permitted to marry this group, but still suggested to be patient and have self control, since it is better for us. The same understanding can be seen in surah 23 Ayah 5-7. Allah teaches us that there are only two types of marriages allowed: the normal one and the marriage with the right hand posses. Whoever exceeds these two limits Allah says they are transgressors . How can Shia place the Mut'a in the previous Ayah when this Ayah clearly limits marriage to these two types?

Also in the Quran, we see that when ever Allah mentions marriage he also teaches us about divorce. When a man marries a chaste woman, and wants to leave her, he has to first divorce her. This can be seen in the following surah and Ayahs, 65:1, 2:231, 2:232, 2:236, 2:37, 33:49, 66:5

In Mut'a, there is no divorce; once you pay the set amount of money and the assigned time ends there is no rights, no duty, no inheritance laws, or divorce process. The only law is that the woman waits for a period of 45 days before she enters into another Mut'a, while the man can have immediate one, even while he is married or in another Mut'a. This goes against what Allah assigned for marriage in the Qura'n. In Surah 2 Ayah 228 Allah says, **Divorced women shall wait concerning themselves for three monthly periods and it is not lawful for them to hide what Allah hath created in their wombs. If they have faith in Allah and the last day."** In Mut'a she can be pregnant with the child of her first Mut'a husband and be married to her second Mut'a husband or the permanent. In the book of Mustadrak-Alwasa il (Shia authentic hadith book) vol. 7 book 3 pg. 506 rewayah 8762 ,it states that the prophet ﷺ said that who ever cannot find the ability to get married let him fast, my ummah s protection is fasting. Also in Beharul-Alanwaar(Shia hadith book in vol.14 pg. 327 rewayah 50:21) it states that Imam Ali said and seek protection from women desire by fasting. What is the need for fasting if Mut'a is OK ? It is obvious that this contradict this idea .I hope and pray that we will take this matter seriously.

Everyday more and more girls in our community are falling victims to this idea presented by the Shia individuals. These girls are helpless in asking anyone for help, especially their parents. Please, teach and inform one another about the idea of Mut'a, and our beliefs regarding it. Please do it **for the honor and dignity of our Islam and for the love of Allah!**

Temporary Marriage & Its Illegitimacy In Islam

Nida'ul Islam Magazine

Of the basics and foundations on which Islam was built was the gradual implementation of injunctions so that people can be prepared to apply these without shock or surprise. In this manner, the impact of the injunctions is less strenuous. This gradualism requires the permissibility of some actions as a temporary measure to deal with situations and circumstances. Then these permissions end as the purpose which they aim to serve is no longer a necessity. Then when the law of Allah was fully revealed, this law remained applicable until the Day of Judgement. Our divine law was completed with the words of the Most High: **"Today I have perfected for you your religion, and completed upon you my favour, and accepted for you Islam as a way of life."** [5:4]. After the revelation of this noble verse, there was no longer any change or exchange. This gradualism in implementation has included many religious laws such as the law relating to alcohol, and the law relating to inheritance and others.

In this short precis, we are focusing on temporary marriage and what is linked to it of practical wisdoms which have been missed on many amongst the common people, to an extent that it facilitated the spread of many false claims about the law of Allah Most High lying about his Messenger ﷺ, and hatred to his righteous companions (r.a.a.).

What is temporary marriage?

It is a temporary marriage upon agreement of the two parties. This temporary marriage was a custom amongst eastern countries, as it was also practised by some men at the dawn of Islam on their missions / trips.

Abdullah Ibn 'Abbas (r.a.a.) said: "Temporary marriage was at the beginning of Islam. A man comes by a town where he has no acquaintances, so he marries for a fixed time depending on his stay in the town, the woman looks after his provisions and prepares his food, until the verse was revealed: "Except to your wives or what your right hands possess." Ibn 'Abbas explained that any relationship beyond this is forbidden. [narrated by Tirmizy]

As temporary marriage was a custom amongst Arabs in the days of ignorance, it would not have been wise to forbid it except gradually, as is the manner of Islam in removing pre-Islamic customs which were contrary to the interests of people.

It is well established that temporary marriage does not agree with the interests of people because it causes loss to the offspring, uses women for fulfilment of the lusts of men, and belittles the value of a woman whom Allah has honoured. So temporary marriage was forbidden.

The evidence of its illegality:

We will show - God willing - some of the countless evidences in order to wipe out some of the maligning accusations which the misguided repeat against Umar Ibnul Khattab (r.a.a.). These people falsely claim that he was the person who forbade it when he was Caliph. Their motive for this false claim was but their blind spite for the companions of the Messenger ﷺ who had succoured him, supported him, and assisted him.

Allah Most High says: **"So whatever you enjoy from them, give them their recompense,**

this is an obligation." [4:24]. This is the verse relied on by those who support temporary marriage. They rely on it either in ignorance or in order to fool others, giving a superficial meaning to the verse without referring to the interpretation of it, and without availing the correct interpretation to the general public. The following is the interpretation of it:

Imam Qurtuby says in his commentary on this verse, the payment in the context is the dowry, it has been called recompense because it is a fee for the enjoyment. This is a support for dowry being a recompense. Alhasan, Mujahid, and others said: The meaning relates to what you have 'enjoyed through your union with women in proper marriage, so **"give them their recompense"** that is, their dowries. Ibn Khuwayz Mindad said: There is no support and it is not permissible to use the verse as a permission for temporary marriage as the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has warned against and has forbidden temporary marriage as Allah Most High said: **"So marry them with the permission of their families."** It is natural for the marriage to take place with the permission of the parents, this is a proper marriage which has a trustee and two witnesses, temporary marriage is not like that. 'A'isha said: "It has been forbidden in the Qur'an in the words of the Most High: **"And those who preserve their private parts except with their spouses or what their right hands possess, then they would have no blame."** [23:5]. Temporary marriage is not regarded as a proper marriage, and the spouse does not fall into the category of what the right hand possesses.

Ibn Katheer says in his commentary on this verse: as you enjoy them, give them their dowries as the Most High said: **"give women their money as a gift"** [4:4]. He has interpreted the generality of this verse to include temporary marriage saying: There is no doubt that it was permitted at the dawn of Islam, and became forbidden afterwards.

Ibn Jawzy says in regards to this verse: some commentators have said: what is meant by this verse is the temporary marriage, and then it was superseded with what has been reported from the Prophet ﷺ when he forbade temporary marriage. This interpretation has no basis. The Prophet ﷺ permitted it then forbade it with his own words, so his later prohibition supersedes the permissibility. As for the verse, it does not touch on temporary marriage. It only relates to enjoyment through proper marriage."

There is a plethora of statements of the Messenger ﷺ which forbid temporary marriage, some of the Hadith include:

According to Sabra Bin Ma'had AlJuhany who said: I was with my cousin when we passed by a woman who liked my youth and a robe which my companion had. So she offered temporary marriage with the robe as the dowry. I married her and spent the night with her. In the next morning, I went to the mosque and heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: **'O people, I had permitted you temporary marriage before, whoever of you has any part in it currently must part with her, and do not take back anything which you may have given them, as Allah Exalted and Majestic has forbidden it until the day of resurrection.'** " [narrated by Muslim, Abu Dawood, Ibn Majah, Nasa'i, and Darimi]

Ali Bin Abi Taleb (r.a.a.) said that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had forbidden temporary marriage on the day of Khaybar and had forbidden the eating of the meat of domestic camels. [narrated by bukhary, Muslim, Tirmizy, Ibn Majah, Nasa'i, Tahawy, Shafi'i, Bayhaqy, and Hazimy]

According to Sufyan Althawry according to Isma'il Bin Umayya according to Alzahry according to Alhassan Bin Mohammad according to **Ali (r.a.a.)** who said to a man: "You are a straying person, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has forbidden temporary marriage and the meat of domestic camels on the day of Khaybar." [Narrated by Muslim and Bayhaqy]

According to Misdad Bin Masarhad according to 'AbdulWareth according to Isma'il Bin Ummaya according to Alzahry who said: "We were with 'Umar Bin 'Abdul'Aziz and we recalled temporary marriage, a man called Rabee' Bin Sabra said to him: 'I testify that according to my father that it happened that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had forbidden it on the farewell pilgrimage.' " [narrated by

Abu Dawood and Imam Ahmad]

According to Abu Huraira (r.a.a.), the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had forbidden or abolished temporary marriage, its marriage and its divorce, its waiting period, and its inheritance. [narrated by DarQutny, Ishaq Bin Rahwiya, and Ibn Habban]

Abu Bakr Bin Hafs reported according to Ibn 'Umar who said: "When **Ali** was given the Caliphate, he thanked Allah Most High and praised Him and said: 'O people, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had permitted temporary marriage three times then forbade it. I swear by Allah, ready to fulfil my oath, that if I find any person who engages in temporary marriage without having ratified this with a proper marriage, I will have him lashed 100 stripes unless he can bring two witnesses to prove that the Messenger ﷺ had permitted it after forbidding it.' " [Ibn Majah]

Imam Muslim has narrated that according to Mohammad Bin 'Abdullah Bin Numayr who said: "My father had narrated to us according to 'Ubaidullah according to Ibn shahab according to Alhassan and 'Abdullah the sons of Mohammad Bin 'Ali according to their father according to '**Ali (r.a.a.)** that he heard Ibn 'Abbas (r.a.a.) being lenient towards temporary marriage, so he said, 'wait Ibn 'Abbas, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had forbidden it on the day of Khaybar when he also prohibited the meat of domestic camels.' "

This evidences illustrates the correctness of the consensus about its prohibition. Particularly as 'Umar Ibnul Khattab (r.a.a.) had mentioned its prohibition from the pulpit and stated its punishment, and reminded the congregation that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had prohibited it and strongly admonished against it, this was at the presence of both the migrants and the supporters, and none disputed it with him or differed with him, knowing well their care and attention to make sure that the truth is always revealed, and any error is corrected as they had done with respect to other issues. Furthermore, the prohibition has been reported according to a number of companions other than 'Umar.

Its prohibition has been reported according to '**Ali Bin Abi Taleb**, 'Abdullah Bin 'Umar, 'Abdullah Bin Mas'ud, 'Abdullah Bin Alzubayr, 'Abdullah Bin 'Abbas who when reminded of its prohibition also supported the prohibition when he understood the references of the others. This is also the understanding of the followers, the scholars, and all the Imams. They were all unanimous on this issue.

To cap the research, below are the opinions of the four Imams; these will leave no excuse for any.

Hanafi Mazhab: stated in Fathul Qadir that the temporary marriage is void, and defined this marriage as a man saying to a woman I will enjoy you so many times for a certain sum of money. He also said in AlHashia after dealing with the two different types of temporary marriage, that it is a contract with a woman which is formed with the intention of not providing security or fosterage for a child, instead it is for a fixed period, and the marriage ends with this period, or a non fixed period based on the person's stay with the wife until he decides to leave, and then the contract is ended.

Shafi'i Mazhab: temporary marriage is a marriage for a period, so if it was requested of a guardian to marry his ward for a month, this would be a void marriage.

Maliki Mazhab: temporary marriage is one for a term, as if saying to the guardian allow me to marry your ward for a month for such a fee, if they agree, the marriage would be void and both spouses would be liable to a penalty. This marriage is ended without a divorce, regardless of whether it is before consummation or after.

Hanbali Mazhab: Temporary marriage is a marriage for a term whether fixed or not, there is no difference whether it is labelled as a marriage or not, where the man says to the woman allow me to enjoy you, she says I give you myself for enjoyment, without a guardian or two witnesses. The temporary marriage raises two issues. One for a fixed term having a guardian and two witnesses, or one called enjoyment not having a guardian or witnesses. In both cases it is void.

After the opinions of the four Mazahib, we report the opinions of scholars from other Mazahib below.

Ibn Hazm said, "temporary marriage is not permitted; this is a fixed marriage which was permitted at the time of the Messenger ﷺ, then Allah superseded it through His Messenger ﷺ until the day of resurrection."

Imam Shawkany: "We worship in accordance with what we learnt from the Messenger ﷺ, and we have ascertained the authenticity of his eternal prohibition of temporary marriage. The fact that some companions were not aware of this does not negate the large number of companions who were aware and who have acted upon the prohibition and proclaimed it."

Qady 'Ayyad said: "The scholars reached consensus that temporary marriage was a marriage for a term with no inheritance, its separation at the expiry of the term without dispute, the consensus after this was that it was prohibited according to all the scholars with the exception of the rejectors. Ibn 'Abbas allowed it until he became aware of the prohibition and then forbade it and said: "If temporary marriage takes place now, it is void regardless of whether it had been consummated or not."

Imam Nawawy said: "The truth of the matter is that it was permitted and prohibited on two occasions. It was permitted before Khaybar, then prohibited, then permitted on the day of liberation, the day of Awtas, then prohibited forever after three days of the event."

Imam Bayhaqi said: **"Imam Ja'far Bin Mohammad was asked about temporary marriage, he said: 'It is adultery.' "**

Before we close this research, we refer to the words of Imam Alfakhr AlRazy in response to those who claim that 'Umar added the prohibition of temporary marriage himself. So they declared him as an apostate and attributed apostasy to all who did not stop him: "all this is erroneous. All that is left to say is that temporary marriage was permitted during the time of the Messenger ﷺ, and I prohibit it with what has been authenticated with me that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ prohibited it."

In this manner we see the manner in which Islam treated the issue of temporary marriage and how it became prohibited forever until the day of resurrection as has reached us through the true Ahadith. There is no doubt that contemplation in this brief message will find in it convincing proof that temporary marriage is prohibited for those who believe in Allah and are free from blind loyalty. We supplicate Allah Most High to make us of those who listen to the words and follow the best standard therein